

10

A
LETTER
TO
THE EARL OF LAUDERDALE,
CONTAINING
STRICTURES
ON
HIS LORDSHIP'S LETTERS,
TO THE
PEERS OF SCOTLAND.

WITH A PREFACE, AND AN ORIGINAL LETTER FROM THE
RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE, TO THE AUTHOR, EX-
PLAINING THE MUCH-PERVERTED EXPRESSION OF
"THE SWinish MULTITUDE."

By JOHN GIFFORD, Esq. *R*

(A NEW EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS.)

Ad Populum Phaleras; ego te intus, et in cute, novi.

Perf. Sat. 3

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. N. LONGMAN AND O. REES, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1800.

LETTER

TO

THE LATE OF ALBERT

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

Printed, at the Anti-Jacobin Press, Peterborough-Court, Fleet-Street, by T. Crowder,
No. 2, Temple-Lane, White-Friars.



PREFACE.

FIVE years have elapsed since the first publication of the following Letter; and, amidst all the shocks, convulsions, and vicissitudes, which different States have experienced, in this momentous interval, no one circumstance has occurred, to invalidate a single inference which, from an attentive consideration of the subject, I had been led to draw, respecting the aggressive principles and the destructive practices of the French Republic. On the contrary, in every act of every tyrant, from ROBESPIERRE to BONAPARTE, who has desolated the country and oppressed its inhabitants, for the last ten years, in peace or in war, in negotiation or hostility, to friends or enemies, in all treaties prescribed by the influence, in all *constitutions* imposed by the arms, of the French rulers, on *emancipated* nations, the same principles and the same practices have been marked in those strong characters which “all who run may read.”

It might, then, be very naturally supposed that, in a case so clear, on circumstances so plain, no difference of sentiment could possibly arise; that, as it is a question not of *opinion*, but of *facts*, not to be decided by *argument* but by *documents*, it might surely be expected, that, where the declarations of public men acting in their public characters, and the official papers of cabinets, were produced

a

duced for the establishment of a point, the only opposition they would experience would be founded on a denial of their authenticity, on a declaration of their spuriousness. In cherishing such expectation, the enemies of republican France could not be deemed unreasonable, as they only demanded an observance of the same upright and rational conduct which they had themselves adopted towards her friends. When the latter drew forth, from the exhaustless stores of Jacobinical fraud, the TREATY OF PAVIA, and introduced it on the political stage, with the language of exultation, and the tone of defiance, the former did not seek, by sophistry and declamation, to resist the forcible conclusions which were drawn from its provisions;—they admitted that, if authentic, the deductions were warranted by the premises;—but they undertook to prove, and most completely did they prove, that it was one of those audacious and profligate forgeries which have been found so useful in procuring proselytes to the new system of revolutionary ethics, and to which the founders of that system had frequent recourse at a very early period indeed*.

Again, it might have been expected, that, when forgeries of this description were detected, the English advocates of English aggression would have the decency at least to acknowledge that they had been deceived, and to abandon the arguments which they had founded on such deception.—*In multis labi humana infirmitas est*;—Every man is subject to imposition; and blame can only attach, with propriety, where sufficient care has not been

* A proof of this may be found in the early proceedings of the Committees of the National Assembly, before their removal to Paris.

taken to avoid it, and where sufficient honesty has not been displayed in the acknowledgement of error. Such acknowledgement is not an act of gratuitous liberality deserving of praise; it is an imperious duty which every public writer and every public character owe to society; it is an indispensable homage which every man owes to conscience and to truth. The advocates to whom I allude, however, have not felt the necessity of discharging this duty, of paying this homage. The spurious treaty, in question, has, since the detection of its origin, been repeatedly urged with the same confidence, and employed for the same purposes, as before. An ancient author has observed, *Populus erroris est magister maximus*;---but, however true this remark may be, in its general application, it is most certain, that, since the French revolution, the *populus*, or rather the *plebs*, has been not the *magister* but the *alumnus* erroris. The *magistri* are to be found among a chosen few, who would as soon give up the benefits of tuition as the honour of instruction.

From what cause this obstinate perseverance in the propagation of error proceeds, I pretend not to decide, whether it be imputable to wilful ignorance, or to that mental perversion to which the poet alludes, *video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor*, but which a less polished bard has characterised in more unequivocal terms, *aliud loqui, sentire aliud, mendacium est*, it must be left to others to determine. With the sentiments which I entertain, I should be doubly culpable, were I not studiously to avoid myself, that which I so strongly condemn in my political adversaries. The reader, therefore, will find in this letter, a voluntary correction of a misrepresentation, into which I had been very innocently

cently betrayed*, in the first edition; where I quoted a printed *memoire*, as the production of SAINT-JUST, a member of the Committee of Public Welfare, during the tyranny of ROBESPIERRE, which I have since discovered to be the fabrication of an emigrant nobleman---a fabrication not the less reprehensible for having been intended to answer a salutary purpose. It is not for Man to use a bad mean for the accomplishment of a good end. Such a jesuitical principle of action has, happily, been long since exploded; and heaven forbid it should ever be revived. This acknowledgement, be it observed, is not the consequence of detection, as the misrepresentation has escaped my assailants and even the critics themselves;---it results, exclusively, from a sense of duty, and a regard for truth.

The revival of the question of aggression, by the official note of M. Talleyrand, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, who, with true republican effrontery, has laboured to fix on the British government a charge, which stands confuted by his own confession

* I eagerly embrace this opportunity, the first which has occurred, to correct another misrepresentation into which I had been betrayed, in the preface to my translation to LALLY-TOLENDAL's "Defence of the Emigrants," where I insinuated that Dr. RENNEL, the present learned and worthy master of the Temple, was the author of "the Pursuits of Literature." The grounds on which that insinuation was founded, it is now needless to repeat. Suffice it to say, that, after a long conversation which I had with the doctor on the subject, I became perfectly sensible of my error; and I now feel it incumbent on me to proclaim my full and decided conviction, that he had not the smallest share nor co-operation in any part of that poem or of the notes. And I cannot but express the astonishment which I experienced at the renewal of this report, (after so long an interval, and after a formal and positive denial of it,) in a late publication, accompanied too by expressions highly offensive, and wholly undeserved. That a Catholic should resist the attacks of a Protestant

confession in 1792 *, was my principal inducement to a republication of the following sheets. On a careful re-perusal of them, I have found no occasion to retract a single argument; I have, however, made some additions to the text, strengthened many of my deductions by fresh proofs, and subjoined many additional notes.

In a late debate on the subject of the negociation, proposed by the mock-sovereign of France, Mr. SHERIDAN did not scruple to assert (if the report of his Speech be correct) that "the decrees passed by France, which were so offensive, particularly that of Nov. 19, 1792, were in themselves too tyrannical to remain, *they have all long since been swept away.*" So little is this the case, that the only time when they were rendered the subject of public discussion in the legislative assembly of the French Republic, not only the idea of repealing them, but even the proposition to limit their operation to countries at war with France, or occupied by her armies, was scornfully and unanimously rejected†. In fact, those decrees have been invariably acted upon by the Republican rulers and generals, nay by Bonaparte himself, in the Austrian Netherlands, in Italy, and

stant Divine, on the nature and tendency of his religious creed, is unquestionably natural; but sneers and sarcasms are at best but unseemly weapons to employ in so serious a contest; and imputations in direct contradiction to positive asseverations, surely requiresome better support than strong suspicions or presumptive evidence. CHARACTER, too, in such cases, even when the question is doubtful, must ever decide it; and the character of Dr. RENNELL cannot fail to stand high in the estimation of all who place a just value on the active and conscientious discharge of the various duties of private life, and on the constant display of an ardent zeal for the defence of our religious and civil establishments.

* See the Note to p. 46-48 of this Letter.

† See p. 53.

in Switzerland. And they remain, at this moment, as much laws of the Republic, as any one article of her new constitutional code. When, soon after the usurpation of the Great Consul, a difficulty arose relative to the execution of an old law respecting the emigrants, Bonaparte, to whom it was referred, observed, that unless that law were repealed by the express provisions of the new code, it, of course, remained in full force. Now, I apprehend, it will exceed even the ingenuity of Mr. SHERIDAN, to decry in that code any repeal of the offensive decrees of November and December, 1792; they were, therefore, not only *not* swept away *long since*, but they *still* remain to be swept away; or, else, to sweep away all the establishments of Europe; and no stronger proof need be required of the continuance of the aggressive and hostile disposition of the French rulers, and of the present Usurper, than the actual existence of those decrees, more than seven years after their birth, notwithstanding all the calamities which they have produced, and notwithstanding the reprobation of enemies, and the intimations of friends.

It is to me, I confess, a matter of much astonishment, that, in all the discussions in Parliament, on this subject, no use has been made of the very important document contained in the memoirs of CHAUSSARD*, which I was the first to recommend to public notice and attention. It is seldom that an historian is so fortunate as to obtain possession of such a document, for it rarely happens that the private instructions of a cabinet to their public agents are suffered to transpire. This paper affords a complete proof of the mischievous *intention* of those memorable decrees, and a full confutation of all the

* See p. 61, *et seq.*

assertions which have been made respecting the sincerity of the professions, and the pacific disposition, of the French government, previous to the declaration of war. The production of such a paper would, I conceive, have superseded the necessity of argument, on that topic at least.

Mr. HERBERT MARSH, in his late publication*, has given a proper degree of importance to this document, among the numerous proofs of aggression, on the part of France, which he has arranged in regular order, thereby rendering a very essential service to the future historian of that eventful period. But I should have deemed myself wholly unqualified for the discussion of the question of aggression, had I neglected to consult any one of the documents on which the narrative of Mr. Marsh is founded. Indeed, the most important of them are expressly referred to in the following pages, with some that have escaped Mr. Marsh himself;—and there is not one of them which I have not read with attention. This writer labours under one gross mistake relative to the conduct of those who have written in defence of the war;—he asserts that they have in general argued the question “on grounds of *expediency* and justice;” but this is by no means the fact; for they have, with very few exceptions, maintained that the war, on the part of Great Britain, was not merely an act of justice, but a measure of absolute, unavoidable, necessity; all their arguments and all their proofs have had a direct tendency to establish this point; and it has, accordingly, been long established, I believe, to the satisfaction of every mind that is open to conviction. This consideration, how-

* “The History of the Politics of Great Britain and France, from the time of the Conference at Pillnitz, to the Declaration of War against Great Britain.”

ever, can, in no degree, diminish the value, or lessen the utility, of Mr. Marsh's history. The friends of truth should never suffer themselves to be *wearied out* by her enemies. The triumph of vicious industry over virtuous indolence is, to the latter, the most disgraceful of all defeats. The effect of a constant repetition of falshood has been admirably described by Mr. BURKE, and the earnest admonitions of his prophetic spirit will not, I trust, be received with ingratitude, or treated with neglect.

So much for the question of aggression, the discussion of which can never fail to reflect honour on this country, and infamy on her enemies. The more the causes and principles of the present war are investigated, the more obvious, I am persuaded, will its necessity, the more just will its object, appear. In alluding to that object, on different occasions, I have invariably stated, that it was not the restoration of monarchy in France, and that they who insisted that it was, mistook, the *means* for the *end*. The recent answer of the British cabinet to the new Gallic usurper, in which all intention of prescribing a form of government to the French, is formally disclaimed, affords a complete demonstration of the accuracy of my statement, and it required all that assurance which so strongly marks the public characters of the present leaders of opposition, to renew an assertion which had been thus solemnly and officially denied in the face of all Europe. Such conduct could have no other effect than that of favouring the views of the great Consul, in his attempt to mislead the wretched objects of his tyranny, as to the real designs of Great Britain,—an effect which every friend to his country must strenuously deprecate.—That Europe will never be effectually secured from the danger
arising

arising from the propagation of French principles, that her security will never be established on a solid or permanent basis, without the restoration of the House of Bourbon to the throne of France, is an impression which I imbibed at an early period of the revolution, and which every subsequent occurrence has tended to confirm. Convinced, then, that this is the only adequate *means* of producing the most salutary *end*, I adhere to the sentiment expressed in the concluding words of my Letter, *DELENDA EST RESPUBLICA GALLICA* with the qualification of a single *if*—*if* it be practicable. That Mr. TIERNEY will not admit the justice of the sentiment, even when thus qualified, I can easily conceive. But men who argue from different premises, are not likely to agree in their conclusions. This gentleman has recently declared, that “the war is not necessary *because* we have refused to negotiate.” Such patriotic inference could only be just *if* (he will pardon me, I hope, for again obtruding on him this offensive conjunction) a safe and honourable peace were synonymous with negotiation. But the refusal to negotiate is a question to be decided by its own merits, and cannot possibly supply any *primâ facie* proof that the war is either necessary or unnecessary. The conclusion, therefore, is alike puerile and illogical.

Mr. TIERNEY made another assertion or two, at the same time, not less worthy of notice. He had no scruple to maintain that the annihilation of Jacobinism had been atchieved by the late revolution in France. How Jacobinism is to be destroyed by the promotion of its professors to places of trust and power in the state, it will require no small portion of Jacobinical ingenuity to discover.—*BONAPARTE* is himself the arch-fiend of Jacobinism,

binism, the cause of which he has constantly served with all the zeal and energy of which his mind is susceptible. He commanded the troops, under BARRAS, formerly his patron, now his prisoner, in the Autumn of 1795, when the Parisians were massacred for daring to claim the rights just conferred on them by the new constitution of that day; his Jacobinical feats, at a subsequent period in Italy, in Switzerland, and in Egypt, are, unhappily, but too well known to the world; nor are his declaration of the incompatibility of the co-existence of the two governments of England and France, and his threat to *Jacobinize* the latter, less notorious. But, perhaps, it may be said, that this usurper has only used Jacobinism as the ladder of his ambition, and that, having now attained the summit, he will kick it from under him. But even this pretext, flimsy as it is, will not avail;—for since his usurpation has been completed, this consular tyrant has recalled the regicide CARNOT, promoted many other known Jacobins to places of importance, and even again taken into favour most of those whom, for the purpose of deception, he had been led to proscribe, at the first moment of the revolution. It has frequently been conceded, by the most rational enemies to unlimited monarchy, that such a form of government would, in many respects, be the best, if there were any means of securing the possession of wisdom and virtue to the monarch. A concession which admits, what, indeed, cannot well be contested, that, on the personal disposition and endowments of the individual vested with absolute power, the prosperity of the people, and the security of surrounding nations, essentially depend. Let then BONAPARTE be tried by this test;—we know his principles and his qualifications; they have been fully displayed in his declarations and his conduct during the last
seven

seven years;—they are written on the map of the world in characters of blood. In him the will and the power of Jacobinism are combined; if, fraught with danger, when divided, how pregnant with destruction must they appear, to every sober mind, in a state of concentration! By Jacobinism, the Consul secured his authority; with Jacobins he shares his profits; and, however present interest may lead him to attempt the amalgamation of this baneful quality with ingredients of an opposite nature, neither the fraud of SIEYES, nor the force of BONAPARTE, will suffice to conceal from Europe, what they must acknowledge themselves, that JACOBINISM IS THE VITAL PRINCIPLE OF THE REPUBLIC.*

But Mr. TIERNEY has made one discovery, which exceeds all former discoveries in the science of politics;---he gravely tells us,--“the principles of Jacobinism, so much dreaded, so much deprecated, always tended to some species of liberty!!!” I confess, I had always been weak enough to believe that these principles were wholly and necessarily destructive of all rational freedom; and my conclusion was drawn not only from an attentive analysis of the theory of Jacobinism, as proclaimed and expounded by its founders, but from a careful consideration of the effects which, when reduced to practice, had resulted from it, in France, in Italy, and in some of the lesser states, within the immediate sphere of its influence. And *how*, forsooth, did Jacobinism tend to produce liberty? Why by “vesting the power in the hands of the people;”--i.e. by turning the whole

* I employ the term *republic* in compliance with the general practice; though fully aware that the present government of France has not one characteristic of a republic. It is a mere military despotism.

fabric of civil society topsy-turvy ; by making the subject sovereign, and by bringing the sovereign to the block. But though the sovereignty of the subject was theoretically acknowledged, could Mr. TIERNEY be ignorant that the slavery of the people was practically established ? or, putting the particular case of France and her tributary states, entirely out of the question, let me ask him whether he means to contend that the *power*, by which, of course, he means the *supreme* or *sovereign* power, ever was, is, or ever can be, vested “ in the hands “ of the people ? ” Is he to be told, in short, that the object of all legal power is to *govern* the people ; that to talk of vesting the government in the hands of the governed is arrant nonsense ; that a declamation on the *sovereignty of the people* may very well serve to flatter the vanity of modern Whigs at a tavern dinner, presided by Mr. BARRISTER ERSKINE, to form the favourite toast of the Premier Duke of England, or to decorate the proclamations of the first consul of France, but must be regarded with sovereign contempt by every man of common sense or sober judgment ; and that any effort to reduce such a senseless doctrine to practice, would be a mad attempt to reverse the order of nature, and to counteract the designs of Providence ? “ Pretendre qu’un même peuple puisse être “ à la fois vis-à-vis de lui-même et souverain “ et sujet, c’est prétendre l’impossible, c’est “ avancer un galimatias indigne d’un être pensant, “ et plus indigne encore d’un *legislateur sage et “ loyal.* ” --- Endeavours to instil false and dangerous ideas of self-importance into the minds of the people, are calculated to render them unfit for the stations which they are destined to occupy in the social world ; and consequently to deprive them of the inestimable advantages which are secured to them

them by the institutions of society. It is a truth not so flattering to their vanity, perhaps, but certainly more conducive to their happiness, that it is their duty to obey and not their right to command. And, however modern demagogues may incline to represent this doctrine, as injurious to their dignity, it constituted the pride of the ancient Romans, even in the days of their greatest liberty, who truly considered the obedience of the subject as forming the whole energy of the state, or as one of their best historians has described it ;---*imperii vis omnis in consensu obedientium.*

If, however, Mr. TIERNEY, and his associates, concur on some points, with BONAPARTE, be it observed, it is only on those points on which the latter differs from the British Ministers, for, on the very material question of the practicability and safety of concluding a peace with the Directory, they are at direct variance. The opposition have invariably insisted that it was both safe and practicable; whereas the First Consul has, through the medium of his instrument, BOULAY DE LA MEURTHE, given a flat contradiction to all their assertions on that subject. "The continuance of the war," said the orator on the eve of the annihilation of the last constitution, "is chiefly owing to the want of a wise, fixed, and truly Republican system of diplomacy among ourselves. If we wished to establish such a system, and to conclude treaties of peace, what security would there be for their observance, in the present state of our political organization?"

"Previous to the 18th Fructidor (Sept. 4th, 1797), the Government exhibited to foreign Powers, every symptom of a precarious existence, and they accordingly refused to treat with it. After that great event, the whole power of the state being
"centered

“ centered in the Directory, treaties of peace were
 “ speedily broken; the Directory, after having
 “ stricken terror into all Europe, and destroyed, at
 “ their pleasure, a number of governments, inca-
 “ pable either of carrying on the war or making a
 “ peace, were overturned with a breath on the 30th
 “ of Prairial. Thus, judging only from notorious
 “ facts, the French Government must be considered
 “ as having nothing fixed, either in respect of men
 “ or things.” The French revolutionists have,
 through the whole of this political contest, thus sup-
 plied their enemies with weapons to combat their
 friends and advocates, who, notwithstanding such
 ungrateful return, still continue, with the most dis-
 interested zeal, to plead their cause with undi-
 minished ardour.

It is to be hoped that the freedom of my obser-
 vations will not again expose me to the vengeance of
 those professed “ Friends to the Freedom of the
 “ Press,” who, like the revolutionary patriots of
 France, would fain limit the enjoyment of freedom
 to their friends, and take it from their enemies.
 Two years have now elapsed since I published “ *A*
 “ *Short Address to the Members of the Loyal Associ-*
 “ *ations, on the present State of Public Affairs.*”
 Lord LAUDERDALE’s name being incidentally men-
 tioned in this Address, which was a mere vehicle for
 information which I had received from the Conti-
 nent, and which I deemed of importance to the public*,
 his

* In this Address I published lists of the Directories; which
 the French Government had kindly provided for their embryo
 children, the future Republics of England, Scotland, and Ire-
 land. These lists were, of course, treated as fabulous by the
 Jacobins, but I know not what their feelings were, if they saw,
 as they might have seen, in a French Paper, printed many months
 after, an acknowledgement that Directors had really been nomi-
 nated

his Lordship immediately conceived the laudable design of prosecuting me for a libel; though it would certainly have puzzled a much wiser head than his to discover any thing of a libellous nature in the Tract. But my presumption in daring to impeach the wisdom of the party, on various occasions, was not to be pardoned. Consultations were accordingly held at *Wooburne*, and in Town, on the propriety and expediency of instituting this important suit. The noble owner of the noble mansion at *Wooburne* protested against the measure, and his Lordship was left in a minority. But this, having long been his fate, he displayed his usual perseverance, his usual contempt of arguments that thwarted his views and opposed his wishes, and magnanimously resolved to proceed. Some observations, however, which, on hearing of his Lordship's determination, I thought proper to add to a new edition of the Tract, had a greater effect on him than all the persuasions of his friends. It is probable he was induced to refer to a case, which had recently been tried in the Court of King's Bench, *Williams v. Wright*, and *therefore* abandoned his purpose. The opportunity, however, appeared too good to be lost; such a culprit could not be suffered to escape with impunity; and the same obstacle which prevented his Lordship's pursuit might not impede the progress of another

nated for two, at least, of these Republics, and two of their names specified, one of which only, I admit, corresponded with the list transmitted to me. I omitted the fifth name, in the list of the Irish Directors, "from motives which even the rankest Jacobin" in the country must respect." The omission was owing to the impending trials at Maidstone, and I now request the readers of that Address to supply it by the insertion of the name of ARTHUR O'CONNOR; who can, at this time, receive no possible injury from the publication of the honour intended for him by his friends at Paris, though it may possibly raise a blush on the cheeks of some of his friends in England.

plaintiff.

plaintiff, The Tract was conned over again; the name of M'CLEOD was discovered, without any christian name, or distinction whatever, 'tis true; but no matter, there could be but *one* M'Cleod in the kingdom, and he was a member of the party; and, thus, to my utter astonishment, was I served with a writ in the name of General M'CLEOD, who, I believe, was brought up from the Highlands of Scotland for the purpose, and of whom I had, most assuredly, never heard nor thought, since the preceding election at *Milbourne-Port*. This action was brought* (in direct contradiction to the opinion of Serjeant LE BLANC, who had been consulted on the occasion) before Trinity Term, 1798; and, anxious to forward the ends of justice, I instructed my attorney to admit the publication, and to abridge the proceedings as much as possible, in order that it might be brought to trial in the sittings after that Term.—The declaration, however, still remains to be filed!

The consistency of such attempts to check the freedom of discussion with the avowed professions of these boasted champions of the liberty of the press, I leave it to their friends and admirers to reconcile. I only notice it here as being a part of a systematic plan which had been formed, but the execution of which was prevented by a failure in the first attempt. From a recent publication, I learn that, after the strange decision of the last House of Commons, respecting Mr. REEVES, the party had it in contemplation to form an Inquisitorial Committee, for the purpose of instituting prosecutions against such writers as should pre-

* It was first resolved to bring the action against my publisher, in avowed revenge for the prosecutions which the Attorney General had instituted against the publishers of some seditious works with whom the party chose to make a common cause!

sume to differ in opinion from them on great political questions, or to consider the origin of government and the frame of our constitution in a different point of view from that in which *they* had been accustomed to regard them. Libels on the Revolution, in 1688, which had furnished an ample theme for declamation, in the discussion to which I have adverted, were, of course, to be considered by these literary inquisitors (who, be it observed, had invariably stigmatized, as spies and informers, all the Members of the Loyal Associations against Republicans and Levellers in 1792), as crimes of the first magnitude. The restrictions which the imputation, or, rather the *invention*, of so strange a crime must necessarily impose on every historian of that important epoch, did not appear to them to be of sufficient importance to require any change or modification of their principle. Such a systematized tyranny over the minds of Englishmen (of Englishmen, too, who professed their admiration of the constitution as it now exists, and who avowed themselves enemies to innovation) as these British senators proposed to introduce into a British House of Commons, would have been truly worthy the National Convention of France, or the still more oppressive system of her First Consul, in respect of the Press.

In examining this new species of offence (for the nature and definition of which the student would search the statute book in vain) it would seem, that no greater libel on the revolution could be penned or uttered, than the declaration that that momentous event was not the work of the nation, that it was atchieved in contradiction to the feelings, the principles, and the wishes of the majority, in numbers, rank, and property ; and that it was, literally,

to use a homely phrase, crammed down the throats of the people. If any opinion delivered, or fact stated, respecting this revolution, can be deemed libellous, such a declaration as this would be the grossest of all libels, because it would be tantamount to an assertion, that it was a Jacobin revolution, in which the powerful minority tyrannized over the weaker majority;—and were I to make an assertion of this nature, I should, I apprehend, not only rouse the indignation of the Whig Club, and call forth the vengeance of LORD LAUDERDALE (whose misrepresentations I may detect, whose ignorance I may expose, and whose errors I may correct, but whose irascible disposition I have not the smallest wish to provoke) but I should incur the pointed censures of many zealous friends to the constitution and government, who might think that this broad unqualified proposition had a tendency to shake the basis of those inestimable advantages which, under the blessing of Providence, we are permitted to derive from the existing institutions of the country. On this point, all my adversaries will, no doubt, agree; and there would, I conceive, be very little difference of opinion among them, as to the degree of punishment that should be inflicted on so atrocious an offender. But I have no cause for apprehension on this score, for I certainly have never committed such an offence; even Mr. REEVES himself was not accused of having advanced so extraordinary a position in the pamphlet imputed to him; and it, unquestionably, is not to be found in his admirable history of the English law, nor in any of his other productions which have fallen under my notice. What Tory, then, what High-Churchman, will it be asked, has been so audacious as to come forward with a proposition so revolting to the sense, so repugnant

pugnant to the feelings of the nation? The proposition has, indeed, been advanced, and that recently; but neither by a tory, a high-churchman, nor yet an Anti-Jacobin;---but by a member of the Whig-Club and a leader of opposition. In the report of the debate, in the House of Commons, on Thursday the 20th of February, 1800, I read the following declaration, imputed to Mr. Sheridan. "*The majority of the nation at that period (in the reign of King William) were JACOBITES*"---that is friends to the monarch who had been declared to have abdicated the throne, and enemies to the reigning family---"*The JACOBITES were composed of the nobility, the landed interest, and were formidable in their principles and opposition to King William.*"---Here then is an unequivocal declaration that, immediately after the revolution, and, of course, at the very period of the revolution itself, the majority of the people, in population and property, were adverse to the measure. If this were, indeed, the fact, it would be a revolution on Jacobinical principles; and though I cannot admit Mr. SHERIDAN to be a fit expounder of English history for the nation at large, he may fairly be supposed to speak the sentiments of his immediate associates respecting this particular event; and thence, we may, perhaps, be enabled to account for the zeal of the present heterogeneous meeting, ycleped the *Whig Club*, in retaining their standard toast---"*The glorious revolution of 1688*"---though at direct variance with its new companion---"*the sovereignty of the people.*"

How Mr. SHERIDAN would have contrived to escape the vengeance of the Inquisitorial Committee, (of which I believe he was to have been a member) had it been established and perpetuated,

I am at a loss to imagine. Far be it from me however to admit, that a man has not a right to advance, in the way of cool and dispassionate argument, any opinion which he may entertain of any public event in our history; provided its promulgation has not an evident and direct tendency to excite public commotions, to lessen the respect of the people for the laws which they are bound to obey, to loosen the ties of subordination, and consequently to dissolve the bonds of society. But, I trust, Mr. SHERIDAN will be more cautious in his future endeavours to restrict in others the use of that right which he exercises with so much freedom himself. From the collision of opposite sentiments, produced by calm and fair discussion, the sparks of truth may be truly said to elicit; but wisdom and expediency seem alike to sanction, in all political investigations at this awful crisis, the adoption of one general basis;—the opposition of practice to theory, of experience to speculation. Neither a *Jacobin* nor a *Jacobite* (though heaven forbid I should confound the two descriptions of men), the object of all the suggestions which I have, at various times, ventured to obtrude upon the public attention, has been the preservation of all those institutions of which we daily and hourly, see and feel the advantages:—advantages which we cannot fail to appreciate, whether we try them by the positive test of actual enjoyment, or by a comparative consideration of the state of other countries. It is my fervent wish, that we may continue most rigidly to adhere to the wise measures of our ancestors, where adherence is productive of a certain good, and innovation only promises a precarious advantage. I do not think we are wiser, I am sure we are not better, than our fathers; it is
with

with pain, therefore, and apprehension, that I witness some occasional deviations from their conduct and principles, which only serve to convince me that we shall advance in vanity, in proportion as we recede from virtue. The omission of the annual sermon at Westminster, on the 30th of January last, affords no proof of improvement, either in religious zeal or political wisdom. Is this the time for weakening those salutary impressions, which the contemplation of a monarch murdered by his subjects must excite? Is this the time for diminishing that horror at the violation of allegiance which tends to fix the wavering and confirm the weak? Is this the time for dispensing with the public repentance of a contrite nation; lamenting the sins of their fathers which *their* religion tells them "will be visited on their children" to the third and fourth generation;" or to give up the *great example* exhibited to the inhabitants of Europe, on this solemn day of expiation and atonement?

If it were purely accidental, the neglect is culpable; but if intentional, it cannot be too severely reprehended*, as it exhibits one of those compromising encouragements

* I have heard that an attempt has been made to justify this omission, by one who ought to know better, on a plea not less extraordinary than false, that the less that is said about the character of the pious prince, for whose murder the piety of our ancestors deemed it necessary to atone by an annual expiation, the better. Ignorance alone could give birth to such a reflection on the character of our first Charles; and happy, most happy is it, for himself, if the individual in question, can conscientiously say, that he discharges all the religious and moral duties of a christian and a man, with the same conscientious scrupulosity, which, whatever political errors he may have committed at one period of his reign, uniformly marked the conduct of that virtuous and persecuted monarch. Besides were his character less excellent,
it

agements which, I am sorry to say, the champions of religious and moral order so frequently give to their adversaries, by so far countenancing their principles. The danger of such compromises, to say nothing of the disgrace which attaches to them, must be obvious to every man, who considers the effects of the temporising policy adopted by the cabinet of Louis XVI. at the commencement of the revolution. Such conduct disgusts many friends, but converts no enemies. Those who are adverse to our establishments, whether in church or state, will loudly applaud our *liberality*, in every sacrifice which we make to their prejudices, but their hostility will still preserve its genuine character, fixed and unchangeable. Every point which we concede will only be used as a plea for some farther concession; and it will be found that in exact proportion as we weaken our own grounds of defence, we shall strengthen their means of attack.---Let us then remain a firm, compact, and united body, for the preservation of our establishments, and of those religious usages and customs, which have grown out of them, and which at once derive protection from, and extend protection to, them.—Let us defend them, with a determined spirit, against the weakness of friends and the strength of foes. Let us resist even the most feeble attempt at invasion or encroachment, sedulously avoiding all

it would be the height of arrogance and presumption in us to impeach the wisdom of our ancestors by the abolition of a religious custom which has been uniformly observed, for near a century and a half;—and that, too, at a time when the Gallic regicides have instituted an annual festival for the *celebration* of the murder of *their* Sovereign!! The contrast was, indeed, humiliating to the advocates of France; and, perhaps, the omission was influenced by a spirit of Christian humility, which shuddered at the idea of exalting us above our neighbours.

relaxation

relaxation of discipline or doctrine; strenuously guarding against a treacherous alliance with enmity in the garb of friendship; and carefully discriminating between toleration and encouragement. Let us diligently shun the approaches of that *false shame* which too frequently leads us to yield up to the raillery or reproaches of others our own sense of propriety. Let us rather subject ourselves to the censures of our opponents, for the retention of prejudices, whether political or religious, than to the reproaches of our own conscience, for the sacrifice of principle. By a strict observance of these plain rules, we shall, in my humble apprehension, best discharge our duty to our KING, our COUNTRY, and our GOD.

March 11th, 1800.

of the Union of Churches; testimony
given, and a strong alliance with
in the interests and action, discomfiting
between religion and the world, but as of
light, upon the witness of that light, and
which the religious world has tried to do
nothing to approach to others, our own sense of
property, but we have injured ourselves to the
character of our own work, for the retention of
things, whether political or religious, than to
the retention of our own conscience, for the sake
of the principle, by assisted assistance of these
own, we shall in any humble application,
but the power of duty to our own, our own
the, without God.

May 11th 1800.

LETTER

TO

THE EARL OF LAUDERDALE.

Un écrit clandestin n'est pas d'un honnête homme;
Quand j'attaque quelqu'un, je le dois, et me nomme.

GRESSET.

MY LORD,

I SHALL not trouble your Lordship or the public with an *apologetical* preface; the *object* of this letter will be sufficiently explained by its contents; the *motives* which have induced its publication are of little consequence. Declarations of inability are but ill calculated to excite attention; and they come with a very bad grace indeed, from one who, in the full presumption of self-confidence, disdains to *court* the approbation which he aspires to *command* *. Of all the different species of affectation, few appear so contemptible or disgusting as the affectation of humility; which, far from bespeaking the absence of pride, generally betrays an excess of vanity. When I see a man preface the discussion of an important point, by an

* See the introduction to Lord Lauderdale's Letters, p. 4.

B

avowal

avowal of his incompetency to the task which he has voluntarily undertaken to perform, I feel strongly inclined to give full credit to his acknowledgement, and to believe that he has, without intending it, justly appreciated the extent of his own talents.

It is not my intention to usurp the critic's office, by entering into a critical analysis of your style, diction, and phraseology; I mean to confine myself to some few observations on different parts of your work, which exhibit inconsistencies that ought to be reconciled, errors that call for exposure, and misrepresentations that require correction. Were I to include *ignorance* in the list of defects, I should not exceed the truth. This is free language, my Lord; but you have set me the example; "it suits the nature of the times."—I shall first notice such of your remarks as relate to France.

You are, I believe, the only writer on the subject of the French Revolution, who has attempted to justify an approbation of that fatal event, by stating the destruction of the old government of France to be essential to the security of England. Considering this as a stroke of address, it commands admiration; since it tends to the reconciliation of principles apparently irreconcilable; but it was certainly necessary to *establish* your position before you availed yourself of it as a ground of argument. You do not, however, think it necessary even to discuss the point; contenting yourself with a few general assertions unfounded in fact, and contradicted by experience. The restless spirit of intrigue that marked the ancient government, and "that habit of the love of military glory and enterprise which was entwined with the monarchy of France," seem to constitute the only basis
of

of your opinion. But did that spirit and that habit really tend to destroy our national security? Does not history prove the very reverse to have been the fact? Does it not shew that a consciousness of the jealousy and disposition of our natural rival has ever superinduced a degree of vigilance and exertion highly conducive to the national welfare? And, notwithstanding the numerous wars in which we have been engaged with France, had we not, during the existence of the monarchy, attained to a degree of prosperity, unexampled in the annals of nations? Undoubtedly we had; and your Lordship is compelled to acknowledge the truth of the assertion, when, contrasting the blessings of peace with the calamities of war, you expatiate with energy on the prosperous state of this country previous to the commencement of the present contest.

The spirit of emulation which is generated by the existence of a powerful rival, imparts new vigour to the body politic: it operates as a salutary stimulus to the constitution, gives strength to the sinews, communicates energy to the nerves, and rouses into action all the dormant faculties of the soul. I should not deserve to be ranked in the class of human beings, did I not deplore the miseries of war; did I not lament the calamities which of necessity result from a state of hostility; did not my heart bleed at the interruption of domestic happiness, at the pangs of domestic sorrows; but reverence for that Being, without whose permission, we are taught to believe, not a sparrow falls, forbids me to question the wisdom of his dispensations, and teaches me to restrain the impetuous sallies of passion, to check the bursting murmurs of indignation, and patiently to submit to what we consider

as evils, which are doubtless suffered to exist for wise and beneficial purposes, though the cause and end of their existence alike elude the grasp of human reason,

“ The ways of Heav’n are dark and intricate,
 “ Puzzled in mazes, and perplex’d with errors,
 “ Our understanding traces them in vain,
 “ Lost and bewilder’d in the fruitless search :”

But admitting, my Lord, by way of argument, that the intriguing and warlike spirit of the old government of France was really so pregnant with danger to this country as you seem to apprehend, let me ask, whether the change which succeeded its dissolution was of such a nature as to effect the destruction of that spirit, and to engender a disposition more favourable to the interests and general welfare of England? You pretend not to assert that the spirit of which you complain was confined to the administration; on the contrary, you say, that it invariably existed, “ whatever might be the “ character of the monarch on the throne, or the “ statesmen that surrounded him,”---of course, you acknowledge, that its existence was wholly independent both of the sovereign and his ministers. It must, therefore, have pervaded the people at large, who---if your own assertions may be credited---have retained all the noxious habits which they contracted under the ancient system. The new order of things, introduced at the revolution, was certainly better calculated to nourish than to suppress the military spirit of the French; exempted from the beneficial restraints to which they had been for ages accustomed, released from all the salutary checks imposed on their native impetuosity by the wisdom of their ancestors, was it reasonable
 to

to expect, that they would spontaneously place a curb on their passions, and, in contradiction to their conduct on former occasions, when a temporary dissolution of government had enabled them to exhibit the most unbounded licentiousness, the most savage ferocity of manners, subject their actions to the guidance of reason and the influence of justice?

How could you, for a moment, be induced to believe, that the demagogues of the day would not endeavour to avert the eyes of the multitude, from internal disasters, sufferings, and misfortunes, by the exhibition of trophies and standards taken from a conquered foe, nor seek to make them forget the desolation of the French territory by the acquisition of foreign states? The only pledge of their moderation you were able to produce, was the pompous declaration, that France renounced all projects of future conquest. Alas! my Lord, why did you not listen to the French Royalists? They would have told you—"They rob us of our property, " reduce our houses to ashes, and massacre our " families with impunity; while the decrees of the " Assembly breathe nothing but respect both to " property and persons. The perfidious wretches " promulgate maxims of morality, which they " daily violate in their conduct to individuals. " Thus do they promise peace to the world, in or- " der to lull the powers of Europe into a false secu- " rity, that when an opportunity shall occur, they " may attack them with a better prospect of " success*."

Your

* "*Lettre à My Lord Lauderdale, par un Gentilhomme François.*"
The author of this pamphlet, whose motto I have adopted, is M.
Desessarts,

Your Lordship must certainly have taken it for granted, that the military spirit of the French was derived from the form of their government; and have thence inferred, that the destruction of the latter must effect the suppression of the former. But here your premises are as false as your conclusion is unfounded. By reading the history of France, you would be enabled to trace the origin of this martial spirit; not to the founder of the Capetian race, not to the father of the Carolingian Dynasty, nor yet to the parent of the Merovingian line; but to a period still more remote: you would find it existing previous to the foundation of the monarchy; and it may indeed be safely averred, that the martial spirit of the people rather influenced the form of government, than that the form of government gave rise to the martial spirit of the people.

Your acknowledgment, that "The continued love of warfare," existed independent of the character of the monarch, or of his ministers, leads to the admission of another point, equally hostile to the general tenor of your arguments: for it suggests, that wars might have been undertaken by the French, which not only did not originate with government, but which were absolutely disapproved by it; and, consequently, that the sovereign, whom you represent as an absolute prince,

Desessarts, a French officer, who has set his Lordship an example of candour, which, it is much to be wished, he would condescend to follow. Many of the defective parts of his Lordship's letters are exposed with ingenuity, and the ignorance of the noble writer is frequently displayed in a strong point of view. I am happy to embrace this opportunity of paying a public tribute of justice to M. Desessarts, who unites the manners of a gentleman with the accomplishments of a scholar.

might

might be constrained to sacrifice his own sense of propriety, to the opinion, or even caprice, of his people. It was certainly not your intention to admit this ; but, that attention to the subject which was requisite to authorize you to speak with decision, would have informed you, that it is not a mere logical deduction, but a case that has actually occurred. It is a fact, that the American war was undertaken at the instigation of the MERCHANTS of France ; who, anxious to deprive their rivals of those sources of emolument, which the latter derived from their trade with America, urged the ministers to engage in that war, to which Louis the Sixteenth was known to be adverse. It was the war of the people ; and a war more unjust in its motives, and more fatal in its effects, the annals of the nation do not exhibit.

One of the most successful modes of exciting sentiments favourable to the French Revolution, to which its friends in this country have had recourse, has been the imputation of every vice creative of disgust to the old government of France. In the performance of this task, a scandalous neglect of candour, and even of truth, has been frequently displayed ; calumny has diffused her blackest venom ; and exaggeration has exerted her most effective powers. The most unfair mode of arguing *ex abusu ad usum*, has been adopted ; excrescences, produced by time, have been represented as radical defects in the vital principle of the constitution ; partial and innocuous privileges have been converted into general and oppressive exemptions ; and obsolete customs have been magnified into efficient laws.

That

That men who have neither consequence to support, nor character to maintain, should become the willing propagators of fabricated tales, favourable to the encouragement of popular prejudice, is a circumstance that occurs too frequently to create surprise. But that a man, holding the rank which your Lordship holds, the head of a noble house, and a member of the British Senate, should afford the sanction of his name to the misconceptions of the weak, or the misrepresentations of the wicked, is an event so little to be expected, as to justify our astonishment when it happens.

You divide, with equal *liberality* and *decorum*, the nobility and clergy of France into two classes,—the *profligate* and the *tyrannical*. Those who frequented the court, you describe as men *corrupted* and *debased* by the mode of their education, and the manner of their lives; and those who resided in the country, as men practiced in the exercise of village-tyranny, and accustomed to the enjoyment of privileges and exemptions, which fostered their pride, and taught them to despise their inferiors.—I am almost tempted to believe, that this horrid picture is not the production of your Lordship's pencil, but that it originally issued from the disordered brain of some democratical maniac. It is a miserable caricature; the features are all distorted; the shade is unrelieved by a single ray of light; and the whole performance betrays the impotent effort of a wretched dauber, disgracing the art in which he aspires to excel.

To quit metaphor;—the talent of discrimination is not, it seems, to be placed in the list of your Lordship's endowments. You disdain to descend to exceptions; and charitably involve, in one
general

general censure, two entire orders of the state. I am not willing to compliment your understanding at the expence of your integrity; and am therefore disposed to believe, that ignorance alone could have engendered so foul a calumny. I am warranted by much personal observation to affirm, that your charge, in its general application, is groundless. Having passed a considerable time in France, I had all the opportunities of observing the habits and manners of the people, which your Lordship could enjoy; and many from which it is more than probable, that you were excluded. I lived in habits of intimacy with several of the since proscribed orders, whose reputation you have so wantonly attacked. I ranked among my friends, prelates, and village curates; persons attached to the court, and others who passed their lives in the country.—The result of my observations, made with no inattentive eye, biassed by no partiality, influenced by no prejudice, was the conviction, that as much true honour, rigid integrity, and genuine philanthropy, were to be found in the nobility of France, as in the nobility of any other country: that the clergy, collectively, were excelled by their brethren in no part of Europe, in fervent piety, purity of manners, and the practice, as men, of the precepts they promulgated, as ministers of religion. Both orders were alike charitable and humane. Exceptions must of course be expected to occur to general observations of this description; but these exceptions, I may safely affirm, did not exceed in proportion, what it would be necessary to make to similar observations on the same orders in other states.—We all know, that noblemen who disgrace their rank, and clergymen who dishonour their profession, are unhappily to be found in every country.

This is a tribute of justice, which I pay the more willingly, as, in the present situation of the unfortunate persons, to whom it is due, no inducement to *flatter* can possibly be supposed to exist.

It was natural to expect that the conduct of the nobility and clergy, since the fatal period of the Revolution, would have effectually secured them from the unjust imputation which you have urged against them. If their minds had really been so *corrupted* and *debased*, as your Lordship has been pleased to depict them, would they have made a voluntary sacrifice of their interest to their principles? An over zealous desire of pecuniary exemptions, alone beneficial to the persons who enjoy them, as you represent those of the two proscribed orders to have been, must originate in a spirit of avarice. Is it then to be credited, that men infected with that spirit would spontaneously sacrifice their very means of subsistence, rather than abandon what constitutes no part of the enjoyments that conduce to the gratification of an avaricious mind? In short could the thousands who have exchanged their friends, their families, estates, and connections, for poverty and exile, rather than incur the guilt of perjury, be actuated by a less worthy motive, than a high sense of honour, and a conscientious attachment to religious principles? And are *such* motives ever known to influence minds, *interested*, *corrupted*, and *debased*? To admit the supposition would be to insult common sense, and to betray the grossest ignorance of human nature!

It is impossible to view, without disgust, the perpetual misrepresentations that mark your laboured attempts to attach odium to whatever was connected with the monarchy of France. In your indis-

indiscriminate censure of the ancient magistracy, you remark, that they “looked with satisfaction at that *extensive privilege of administering justice or injustice*, over his people, which they had *purchased from the Sovereign*.” Thus you positively advance, that the Kings of France sold to the magistrates, the privilege of administering injustice ! An assertion so preposterous requires no comment ; its object and tendency are too obvious to be mistaken. If expressions of loose import, subject to various constructions, and confined to no determinate object, be improper for men of rank and authority to use, how much more improper are all pitiful efforts *ad captandum vulgus*.

Having charitably consigned to lasting ignominy the higher order of the state, you proceed to comment, with equal candour, on the situation of the lower class of people, whom you represent as being totally destitute of property, as being, in many instances, robbed of a great proportion of the pittance they could earn, as rendered cruel *in their nature*, by the habitual want of feeling they had experienced on the part of their superiors, and savage, from the oppressions to which their minds had been trained.---A very striking picture, truly ! And a worthy companion to the preceding one ! In order to illustrate your position, and to establish this universal wretchedness, which, by the magic of your pencil, is made to extend over the most beautiful, the most fertile, and, in appearance, at least, the most *happy* country in Europe ; you quote some passages from the works of Mr. Arthur Young, because forsooth, (as you assert contrary to the fact,) “they were recommended by Mr. Reeves, and his association.” I have, however, a right to infer, that the true reason of your

contenting yourself with these extracts, was your inability to advance any thing more convincing in support of your assertions;---whatever was your motive, I am authorized to consider you as having adopted the facts they exhibit.

A much smaller portion of sagacity than that which your Lordship is supposed to possess would enable any man to detect the gross absurdity of forming an idea of the situation of a country, from the accounts of a beggar on the high road, (the authority referred to by Mr. Young). The object of such persons is to excite commiseration, and no arts which cunning can suggest, or necessity invent, are left unemployed for the accomplishment of their purpose. It is well known, that the French beggars possessed the peculiar talent of adapting the form of their supplications to the humour of the persons they addressed, whenever, by entering into conversation, an opportunity was allowed them for discovering it. It would be no difficult matter to discover, in a much less space of time than was requisite for ascending a long hill, the peculiar bent of Mr. Young's mind; his enquiries into the state of agriculture, taxes, &c. would naturally give the wished for clue, and the consequence was such as might be expected. Who has not occasionally heard, in the most plentiful season, the beggar's habitual complaint of "The hardness of the times," or the interested assertion of idleness, that, "no work is to be had;" when our manufactures found ample employment for every one disposed to work. Indeed, my Lord, the fabricated tale of a mendicant will afford but paltry materials for ascertaining the state of a nation.

You also assert, through the medium of Mr. Young, that as country labour was 76 per cent.
cheaper

cheaper in France than in England, all those classes, which depended on labour, were 76 per cent. *less at their ease*, worse fed, worse cloathed, and worse supported both in sickness and in health, than the same classes in England. But did it really not occur to your Lordship, that the establishment of a *previous fact* was indispensibly requisite to demonstrate the truth of this assertion? Were you really so dull of apprehension as not to perceive that unless every article of consumption bore the same price in France as in England, the observation, destitute of a basis, must fall to the ground? And did you not know, that all the necessaries of life were to be purchased at a much cheaper rate in France than in England, I mean before the revolution? It is ridiculous to suppose, that men are *less at their ease*, than persons of the same condition in other countries, because they eat not the same food, and drink not the same liquor. I am convinced that the French peasants would have been as little inclined to propose an exchange of their *soupe aux herbes*, and their *petit cidre*, or *petit vin*, for the bread, and cheese, and beer, of our English rustics, as the latter would to accede to the proposal, if it had ever been made to them.

With food as well the peasant is supply'd,
On Ida's cliff, as Arno's shelvy side:
And though the rocky-crested summits frown,
These rocks, by *custom*, turn to beds of down.

Among the specific instances of oppression, which you have selected from the travels of Mr. Young, whose pithy and laconic mode of describing the state of a country, has, at least, the merit of originality, are some that are truly curious. For instance, we are told that the peasants
of

of Argentan pay for their cottages, including all taxes and other charges, about two and twenty shillings a year, and have their fuel for the trouble of getting it! Will your Lordship condescend to point out any part of England, in which the peasants are accommodated at so cheap a rate? If you cannot find any place in which this is the case, will you explain your object, in selecting as an instance of oppression, what is certainly the very reverse?

Again---“ST. GEORGE.---They eat buck-wheat made in very thin cakes, without leaven.” Pray, my Lord, what do the peasants of Scotland eat? *Bannocks*, i. e. oatmeal made into very thin cakes, without leaven; resembling, in durity and colour, a piece of dirty board.

“PELLECOY.---Poor women picking weeds into their aprons, to feed their cows with:—it conveys an idea of poverty, and want of employment.”

You will certainly acknowledge, that in Scotland, and, indeed, in most parts of England, few poor women have cows to feed. How this circumstance can be construed into a symptom of poverty, I am at a loss to conceive; nor am I less astonished, that Mr. Young should have considered that time as mis-spent, which was devoted to the purpose of clearing the ground from noxious weeds, and of providing food for so useful an animal, at no other expence, than the labour of getting it.

“FALAISE.---Live very badly, much of the bread is barley and buck-wheat, and many have nothing else but this and water, unless cyder happens to be very cheap;---their fuel, what wood they can steal.”

The

The Scottish peasantry seldom, if ever, eat bread. Bannocks are their chief food. I have seen a *farmer* in the highlands, whose house consisted of a single room, miserably thatched, with mud walls, and no floor, the fire lighted on the ground, and the only chimney a hole in the thatch, dine with his family, on bannocks, and a kettle of grease or lard :---*one* spoon served father and son, who alternately took a mouthful of grease, and a piece of bannock : their drink was water, their fuel peat from the bogs. Mr. Young is incorrect in asserting that the Norman peasants had no wood but what they stole ; for they had generally permission to cut wood for their own use in the woods of the lord on whose territory they resided.

“ MORLAIX TO BREST.---The people of the country are all dressed in great trowsers, like breeches ; many of them with naked legs, and most with wooden shoes.—The women seemed from their persons and features, to be harder worked than horses.”

To adopt Mr. Young's stile—from KELSO to JOHN O'GROAT's,—The people of the country, with few exceptions, are all dressed in a kind of short petticoat, that don't reach their knees, which are quite bare.—I've seen a shepherd on the Grampion-hills, with no other covering than a tattered plaid, to screen him from “ the pelting of the pitiless storm.” The women seemed from their faces, to have neither soap nor water.

“ LYONS.—“ A room for a manufacturer, 200 to 300 livres, and house-rent, *of all sorts*, very dear : 20,000 people are now (1790) starving ; yet *charities, of all sorts, do not amount to less than a million of livres a year.*”

This

This is a most unfortunate quotation for your Lordship! The high price of house rent, at Lyons, affords an indisputable proof of the wealth of the town, and the flourishing state of the manufactories, under the old government, for no alteration in the price, as fixed many years before, had yet taken place. While the starving thousands demonstrate the blessed effects of that "Stupendous monument of human wisdom, and of human happiness," THE FRENCH REVOLUTION:—and the extent of the charities (little less than 42,000*l.*) sterling, per annum) exhibited a striking instance of "*the habitual want of feeling*," which the people "*had experienced on the part of their superiors*;" and of "*the oppression to which their minds had so long been trained* * ! ! !"—"OUT OF THINE OWN MOUTH WILL I CONDEMN THEE."

C 3

In

* Mr. Young himself has, in a subsequent publication, informed the public of the true causes of the distress experienced by the unfortunate inhabitants of Lyons. "I may venture to assert with confidence, that every fabric wrought from foreign materials, *such as the whole business of Lyons*, and a considerable portion of the woollen fabrics, are in absolute ruin; the masters and undertakers, bankrupts or fled; the workmen begging in the streets, subsisting by charity, or wandering vagabond banditti: the *brigands* that infest the country, by endeavouring to wring from the peasantry, a portion of that bread they are unable fairly to earn. *Such is the lot which the new doctrines of equality have produced for Lyons, the second city in France*, as well as numerous other places that once were flourishing."—"Knocking brains out, does not set looms a-going; nor does the exercise of the pike in the guts of a mayor and his aldermen, bring Italian silks to Lyons, or Spanish wool to Louviers." *The example of France, a warning to Britain*, P. 85. Mr. Young has, I know, contended, that the equality of 1792 differed essentially from the equality of 1789; and relies, for the truth of his position, on the appellation bestowed by the French, on the former year, which they distinguished as the *first* of equality. That many members of the Constituent Assembly meant only to sanction

In adverting to the state of the lower classes or people in Scotland, it is very far from my intention

tion the existence of an *equality of political rights*, I am perfectly willing to admit ; but I am equally convinced, that the object of numbers was to produce anarchy, by persuading the people, that they were entitled to the establishment of an *absolute and perfect equality*, and that the decree of the assembly must be so interpreted. Indeed it is notorious, that the institution of an *agrarian law*, was the general topic of conversation in many of the Provinces, and in some had been *seriously proposed*. One of the most intelligent and able writers of the day, M. Rivàrol, who published his political journal, in the name of the Abbé Sabatier, speaking of the declaration of rights, says—" It contains a vague metaphysical doctrine, which the people found unintelligible and unsatisfactory. It became necessary, therefore, in order to satisfy that imperious master, to descend from theory and principles the most abstract, to consequences and applications the most material, of the sovereignty of the people, and of the *absolute equality of men*." This author wrote in 1789 and 1790.—Since the first appearance of this letter Mr. Young has, by the publication of various useful and well written tracts, proved himself a strenuous champion for the cause of social order against the levelling principles of republican France. But few minds possess that combination of ingenuousness and fortitude, which has recently been displayed by a very able writer, on the question of an Union with Ireland, from whose pamphlet, I cannot resist the temptation of extracting the passage which has extorted from me this tribute of justice.—

" At the origin of the French revolution, I acknowledge, with shame and confusion, that I was rash, ought I to say impudent enough, to oppose my shallow judgment to the opinions of that great man, who took such a large and comprehensive view of human affairs ; whose whole life was dedicated to the support of genuine liberty, which he best knew how to distinguish from despotism assuming that name ; who fought in her sacred cause against the oppressors of their species, whether invested with vice-regal government in India, or possessing supreme power in Europe ; who pointed out with prophetic wisdom the crimes which now desolate the civilized world in their seeds and first causes ; whose eloquent indignation will for ever vindicate the majesty of justice against the chance of arms, and condemn the authors of the French revolution to the everlasting horror of mankind, notwithstanding the dazzling successes of its fanatic armies. The only atonement I can make for my presumption is to confess it, and to offer this slender tribute at the shrine which wisdom and virtue are preparing for their votary

to insinuate, that it arises, in the smallest degree, from the uncharitableness or oppression of their su-

in the temple of Immortality. Some ignorant fanatics have raised a clamour about consistency, which would oppose a false shame to the progress of the human mind, and bind a man down to his first opinions, notwithstanding the increasing wisdom of years, and the new facts that may arise on the theatre of the world. All propositions in politics, as well as in every other science, are abridged expressions of facts; and a person might as well begin a course of chymical experiments, resolving to be of the same opinion at the end he was at the beginning, as take a pride in preserving an uniformity of sentiment through a long succession of interesting events in the political world. A variety of causes have crowded more political instruction within these last ten years, than is perhaps scattered over the rest of history; and I cannot think highly of that mind which has remained stationary during the progress of the French revolution. But I cannot make use of the apology, which I readily allow is fair and candid in others whom I have heard avail themselves of it, that their detestation of the French government and principles, in the year 1779, is perfectly consistent with their admiration of them ten years ago, since the thing is entirely changed; and that they alone are inconsistent, who, admiring what is called a monarchy then, admire what is called a republic now; and applaud with the same enthusiasm the successes of the French armies at present, and the ambitious military spirit which their government has displayed, as they at that period commended the pacific spirit the first Assembly was supposed to manifest in their entire renunciation of conquests (a). I make no such apology—I frankly confess

(a.) “ In order to comprehend the nature of this uncalled for declaration, we must attend a little to the history of the French Revolution: The party which prevailed in the first Assembly was chiefly composed of metaphysicians, or, as they called themselves, philosophers, who came to the government of men and the conduct of great affairs, wild with all the crude speculations which they had learnt in their closets. They considered human society as a *tabula rasa*, on which they might scribble all their fantastic notions and ridiculous theories. Presumption is ever the characteristic of this set of men. The municipal law of France, composed partly of the old Roman civil law, and partly of the provincial customs of the kingdom methodized and applied to particular cases, by a succession of learned men, was one of the first objects on which they exercised their spirit of philosophic legislation. They did not find it to agree with any of their theories. Accordingly, by one sweeping decree, they abolished this system of artificial equity which had grown up under the guide of experience by the accumulated wisdom of ages. Thus they left individuals without any regulation in their private concerns, society without any of the ties or holdings which keep

periors; I know the Scottish nobility and gentry to be as exempt from the disposition which generates those

confess my error. I admired, in the year 1789, what I now think was at that time so far from admirable, that it was detestable. I entertain sentiments in the highest degree hostile to the sect which predominated in the first Assembly of France. I think they planted the seeds of all the subsequent disorders. That specious philosophy, which, appealing to first principles, and superseding all positive institution, then seduced me by the soothing cant of humanity (b) which it spoke, appears to me the

D 2

prime

keep it together: then arose the men of violence and blood, who, by a just dispensation of Providence, sent whole sets of these prating philosophers to the guillotine. Bold and barefaced robbery and murder entered by the breach which shallow speculation had made. Once the community was set loose from every restraint of law and religion; men who were not amused by empty declamations, but went straight forward to their purpose, of course prevailed. It is the order of things in this confused and distracted state of society: Thucydides remarked it in ancient Greece; modern France affords another terrible example of it: a Condorcet, a Brisot, a Verginaud, go before—a Danton, a Robespierre follow.

(b) "It is remarkable that this cant of humanity has generally preceded the most savage cruelties. Nero lamented in the beginning of his reign, that he was able to write, as he was thereby compelled to sign the death-warrants of criminals. Robespierre, soon after he entered upon the public stage, proposed the abolition of the punishment of death. A work which that extortioner Barrere published about two years ago, is extremely humorous in this respect; that atrocious wretch, whose crimes have no parallel * in history, who is judged too bad for the Council of Elders or Youngsters (I forget which), speaks of the pure heart-felt satisfaction which he reserves for his declining years, when his heirs shall have grown grey under persecution, to read the vindication of his calumniated innocence in the circle of his weeping family. One would think we were perusing the language of virtuous discontent, coming from some venerable Cato retiring from the ingratitude of mankind.

"The works of Rousseau have been very pernicious in this respect; they have taught the scoundrels of the present day to blend the jargon of sentiment with the perpetration of the greatest crimes."

* "See, for the odious mixture of libertinism and cruelty which marked the government of this man, a short pamphlet by one Villat, † an ex-juror of the Revolutionary Tribunal of Paris, published soon after the fall of Robespierre."

† The Tract to which Mr. Moore here alludes is entitled, "Les Causes Secrettes de la Revolution du Thermidor" par Vilate, &c. There were various pamphlets published about the same time which proved Voltaire's character of his countrymen—described as a mixture of the Ape and the Tiger—to be wonderfully accurate. Though the qualities of the Ape have, since the Revolution, been too frequently eclipsed by those of an animal infinitely more odious and disgusting.

those vices, as any description of persons in any quarter of the globe; still less do I mean to infer, from the difference in their mode of living, and external appearance, which prevails between the people of that country, and those of England, and of France, that the former are *less at their ease* than the latter; a very superficial attention to the effects of habit on the human mind, will suffice to prevent the adoption of such hasty and unwarrantable deductions.—My object is to shew, first—That Mr. Young's construction, (which your Lordship has adopted,) that the difference of the manners of the lower people, in different kingdoms, is solely to be imputed *to government*, stands contradicted by reason and fact. And secondly—to prove that, if your Lordship's indignation be roused, or your commiseration excited, by the contemplation of similar objects, you might have found a sufficient number of them *at home*, to engross your attention.

Having exposed the fallacy of relying on a beggar's tale, or such superficial observations as those above-noticed, for ascertaining the real state of a country, I shall now proceed to examine the validity of some farther quotations adduced by your Lordship in support of your favourite position.—These are intended to prove, that the people were

prime cause of all the massacres at which humanity shudders; and can find no palliative, but in the apologies of men who would excuse the cruelties of Nero, if he had bethought himself to call his government a republic, and his administration liberty.

“ These are the sentiments which I have not called up to serve the purpose of the present day, but which I have proclaimed as my firm and ardent conviction for these three years past, to the knowledge of all my acquaintances—*Observations on the Union, Orange Associations, and other Subjects of Domestic Policy, with Reflections on the late Events on the Continent.* By George Moore, Esq. Barrister at Law.

oppressed

oppressed by the onerous exaction of imposts, levied *exclusively* upon them; and by the existence of feudal customs, originating in tyranny, and enforced with rigour.

“—What must have been the state of the poor people paying heavy taxes, from which the nobility and clergy were exempted? A cruel aggravation of their misery, to see those who could best afford to pay, exempted, *because they were able!*—The inrollments for the militia, which the Cahiers call injustice without example, were another dreadful scourge on the peasantry; and, as married men were exempted from it, occasioned in some degree that mischievous population, which brought beings into the world, in order for little else than to be starved. The Corvées, or police of the roads, were annually the ruin of many hundreds of farmers;—all these oppressions fell on the Tiers Etat only; the nobility and clergy having been equally exempted from Tailles, Militia, and Corvées.” —

By adopting one part of this quotation, my Lord, you have reduced yourself to an awkward dilemma. Either you were ignorant that the paternal heart of the murdered Louis, whose highest gratification consisted in his ability to contribute to the ease and welfare of his subjects, and spontaneously dictated the necessity of abolishing the oppressive custom of the *Corvée*, and that the benevolent monarch had, *some years before the revolution*, made considerable advances towards the accomplishment of that desirable object;—or you wilfully suppressed an important fact with a view to strengthen your argument.—In the first case, the insufficiency of your information, arising, probably, from the limitation of your enquiries to one particular

cular point, rendered you incapable of speaking with the tone of decision, which you have ventured, nevertheless, to assume, in respect of the laws and customs of France, under the old government; and, in the second, you have subjected yourself to the imputation of a wilful error, which the laws of your native country characterize in rather *uncourtly* terms*.

The supposition that the superior orders were exempted from the payment of taxes, "*because they were able,*" is the most absurd and preposterous that ever entered the head of man. If ability to pay had been the ground of exemption, all, of whatever rank, who had acquired a competency, would of course have enjoyed the privilege, and we should have witnessed the curious example of a state, supported, exclusively, by those who were unable to contribute to its support!—*Risum tenetis!*

But so much having been said to mislead the public, with respect to the nature and extent of the exemptions enjoyed by the privileged orders in France, it becomes necessary to offer a few explanatory remarks on the subject. Every body knows, that the nobility and clergy were possessed of certain privileges and immunities secured by the laws of the realm, and consecrated by the practice of their ancestors. The preservation of these constituted an essential part of their *duty*, inasmuch as the existence of the monarchy was closely connected with them. Montesquieu says—"The abolition of the preroga-

* "Falsehood, in a large sense, is the fraudulent imitation or "*suppression of truth*, to the damage of another."—*The principles of the Law of Scotland*, 8vo. p. 487.

“tives of the nobility, clergy, and communities,
 “in a monarchical state, would lead to the speedy
 “establishment of a popular government, or else
 “of a despotic government*.”---It was this consideration that induced the *Tiers-Etat* to display, in former times, at the convention of the States-General, the greatest anxiety to maintain the rights of the nobility and clergy, and humbly to supplicate their sovereign to suffer no invasion thereof, but to respect their franchises and immunities. “Those men, who were unenlightened by the
 “philosophy of the *eighteenth* century, knew that
 “a martial noblesse, to whom custom had interdicted the pursuit of any lucrative profession,
 “were ever ready to sacrifice their property, and
 “to shed their blood in the defence of their king
 “and country. They knew that these exemptions
 “afforded but a slender compensation for the fatigues of war, and the necessity of neglecting
 “their personal concerns, in order to attend to those of the state†.” But a brief review of the principal taxes established under the old government will best explain the nature of such exemptions.

The *Vingtiemes*, which may be considered as an impost merely territorial, were paid alike by the nobility and the *Tiers-Etat*. A great part of the clergy was exempted, but the extent of their contributions, under a different form, constituted an ample equivalent. The duties upon the different articles of general consumption were

* “De L’Esprit des Loix:” liv. 2. chap. 4.—How completely have the events of the French revolution confirmed the judicious observation of Montesquieu!

† M. Desessarts.

of course paid by all the consumers; and it will scarcely be contented, that the most opulent class bore the smallest part of the burthen. The only exceptions which subsisted were in the *pays d'Etat*, such as Artois and Brittany, where the two first orders were exempted from paying the tax upon liquors. But these exemptions will not be deemed very important—viewed either with regard to the interest of the superior orders, or to the additional weight thereby imposed on the lower classes---when it is known, that in the province of Artois they did not exceed eight hundred guineas annually, even including the exemptions enjoyed by the privileged members of the Tiers-Etat. The nobility were subject to the poll-tax.

Of the *Tailles*—the impost from which it has been falsely asserted the nobility and clergy enjoyed a total exemption—there were two species; the one personal, the other real; that is to say, in one part of the kingdom, the right of exemption was annexed to the property; in the other, to the quality of the proprietor; in the first case the privilege was equally enjoyed by every class of persons. The *roturier*, who was proprietor of a fief, was exempted as well as his tenants from the tax, while the gentleman, whose estate was holden by a different tenure, was obliged to pay it. In those provinces, where the other custom obtained, the exemption was confined to a certain extent of property, and to *that* only, while it continued in the actual occupation of the privileged person. But it very seldom happened, that the French nobility kept any land in their own hands, and all the land
that

that was let to farmers was chargeable with the tax, and of course it was then ultimately paid by the landlord. The same observations apply, with still greater force, to the clergy, who always let their estates.

Without entering into farther particulars, it will suffice to observe, that, by a formal declaration of M. Neckar to the constituent assembly, it appeared that all the pecuniary exemptions, enjoyed by the privileged classes, did not exceed annually in value, seven millions of livres (something less than two hundred and ninety-two thousand pounds); that the exemptions appertaining to the privileged members of the Tiers-Etat, amounted to one half of that sum; and that the *Droits de Controle**, and the high capitation tax, (proportioned to their rank,) paid by the nobility and clergy, made ample amends to the revenue for the partial exemptions which they enjoyed from other taxes. Thus, my Lord, the rash assertion, that the privileged classes, under the old government, did not contribute their portion to the support of the state, stands contradicted by one, whose competency to decide on the subject, no man will presume to deny!

That the militia forms the best constitutional defence of a state, few, I apprehend, will be disposed to doubt. In France that establishment was conducted nearly on the same principles as it is in England. The men were drawn by lot,

* The *Contrôle* was a duty imposed on public deeds; it was regulated by the sums specified in the deed, and the rank of the parties who subscribed it. So that noblemen, of course, paid a very high duty, when the inferior orders paid a very low one. Thus what the privileged classes gained by one regulation, they lost by another.

and were only called out a few days in a year, when they received regular pay. The nobility were certainly exempted from the risk of being drawn—and for the best possible reason—because most of them had commissions in the regulars, and such as had not were engaged in professions, that rendered it impossible for them to serve in the militia. The common people were undoubtedly averse from a system which subjected them to particular restraints, and, where interest or comfort was the sacrifice required, were loth to admit the validity of arguments which tended to impress them with a just sense of the duty which they owed to their country. But if such aversion were to be deemed a sufficient reason for abolishing all regulations to which it applies, few states, I apprehend, would find the means of support in time of peace, or of defence, in time of war. The universal *destroyers* of France, however, made the experiment, and abolished the militia; but its suppression was speedily followed by the establishment of a military conscription, which one of the *popular* leaders, Du Bois de Crancé, found it necessary to propose.

It might naturally have been expected, that the exemption of married men from the effects of the militia laws would at least have escaped the censure, indiscriminately bestowed on the exemptions enjoyed by the privileged classes; since it displayed a proper determination to sanction no interruption of domestic happiness, but such as the welfare of the state indispensibly required. But it did not suit your plan to allow the smallest degree of merit to any of the laws, regulations, or institutions, which subsisted under the old government

vernment. Your Lordship, however, would do well to explain—and the author, whose arguments you adopt in support of your own system, is surely entitled to this mark of attention—how “the enrollments for the militia” could tend to occasion a mischievous population, for it must certainly appear to every plain man, who has no pretension to philosophical acquirements, that, if the enrollments had *not* taken place, the married men would have continued to propagate their species exactly in the same proportion! The fact is, that the enrollments and the exemptions are confounded, in the construction of this curious sentence, alike remarkable for its *elegance* and *accuracy*, and it could not be expected that you should have the judgement to correct errors, which you have not the sagacity to perceive.

I have little doubt, but that one of your principal inducements to undertake the pious task of rendering the nobility of France objects of execration to your countrymen, was a wish to shew, that the same principles which were employed to sanction their abolition, would not apply to the suppression of the English aristocracy. But the establishment of this point would, unfortunately, require more argument than you have bestowed on it, and even more than is contained in your whole book. Admit but the principle on which the French revolutionists have acted, either in the suppression of aristocracy, or in the abolition of monarchy, and you will soon find yourselves destitute of weapons to resist its *general* application. Could any infatuation lead us to acknowledge the validity

of those pleas which have reduced the House of Bourbon, to its present unhappy situation; I much fear, we should very soon have cause to tremble for the political existence (at least) of the House of Hanover.—You should recollect, my Lord, that when Montesquieu so strenuously maintained the necessity of a nobility in a monarchical government, he had the French noblesse immediately before his eyes; he knew the precise extent of their privileges, and the degree of influence which they possessed in the political scale; and yet he never attempted to except France from his general observation.

Such of your assertions, on the state of the “*component parts*,” of the French nation, as are unsupported by argument, I shall not stop to notice; but shall consider them as “*verba et voces, pretereaque nihil*.” You observe,—from Mr. Young, again—that the exactions of the seigneur from his vassals were enormous; and cite a number of ancient customs—the dregs of the feudal system,—which are termed “the *tortures* of the peasantry in *Bretagne*.” But you ought to have known that there exists not in the whole kingdom of France, a single custom which could justify the application of such an expression. All the feudal customs of that description were so obsolete, that I believe scarcely a single instance of their being enforced is to be found in any of the most ancient historians;—nor were they by any means peculiar to France, since, in most countries, where the feudal system has prevailed in its utmost vigour, for any length of time, similar vestiges of the barbarism of the early ages of society may easily be traced.

It

It would not be amiss, my Lord, to advert to the *origin* of these customs, which it has, of late, been so much the fashion to revile. We should then find, that to them we are indebted for that diffusion of property, which so essentially tends to promote the welfare and prosperity of a state. When the original proprietors of land ceded a part of their estates to their vassals, they had undoubtedly a right to propose any terms which they thought proper; since it was optional with the vassal, either to accept or reject them. Some exacted a certain proportion of the produce of the land which they ceded; others required that the tenant should cultivate a part of the land, which the Lord retained in his own possession; others again demanded, that the vassal should, at his own expence, maintain the roads, on the Lord's estate; keep his house in repair; or supply him with a given quantity of provision. Then, as now, there were some Lords more actuated by caprice, than governed by reason, and these frequently exacted the observance of some ridiculous custom, conducive to the gratification of their particular whim. Subject to the terms imposed, the vassal possessed his estate, and transmitted it, with the same incumbrance, to his posterity; while the property of the Lord was also transmitted to *his* posterity, accompanied by the advantages derived from the payment of those quit-rents, or the observance of those customs, which were originally proposed by the landlord and accepted by the tenant. If the latter failed to fulfil the terms of his contract, the former had an indisputable right to resume his lands. All feudal rights of this description constituted a part of the lawful property of the Lord;
and

and the estates, to which they were attached, when offered for sale, were purchased at a price that bore some proportion to the number and value of those rights.

It is not every custom which appears oppressive to a foreigner that really is so. The *bannalité*, or custom which compelled the inhabitants of certain districts to grind their corn in a particular mill, or bake their bread in a particular oven, belonging to the Lord, has been considered and cited as an instance of oppression. But it has frequently happened, that the Lord has wished to resign this onerous privilege, and the inhabitants have compelled him to retain it; and the peasants, in different places have expressed their regret at its abolition by the constituent assembly*. The fact is, that the price to be paid for grinding and baking was fixed ages ago, and was, of course, greatly inadequate to the labour, and other necessary expenses, attending such establishments, in more modern times.—The edicts, prohibiting weeding and hoeing, lest the young partridges should be disturbed and others, for preserving the game, quoted by your Lordship, are, indeed, to be found in the collection of the ancient feudal institutions in France, but, at the period of the revolution, “they were neither enforced, nor was “it possible to enforce them.” The only places in which every thing was sacrificed to the preservation of the game were those grounds which had been reserved by the royal family for their own amusements; and there the farmers experienced no hardships, for their rents were proportioned to the

* M. Desessarts.

losses to which they were subjected, and every thing destroyed was regularly paid for.

Having thus removed the basis of your arguments on the relative situation of the nobility and common people in France, I might be justified in giving no other answer than an unqualified contradiction to the preposterous assertion, that the nobles were "isolated from the rest of the state, and that their privilege alone consisted in the power to oppress:" but I chuse to let one of that proscribed body, whom persecution at home has only exposed to calumny abroad, speak for himself; his knowledge on the subject no one will question; and his integrity, my lord, is certainly not inferior to your own.

"The nobility, who could only be rich so long
 "as their vassals were in easy circumstances, were
 "ever anxious to afford them relief; and, far from
 "exercising tyranny in the villages, on their estates,
 "they were careful to establish schools; to relieve
 "the wants of the industrious; and to administer
 "comfort to the sick. The government, favour-
 "ing the beneficent designs of the nobles, sent an
 "annual supply of medicines, of the best quality,
 "into the provinces, where they were distributed,
 "gratis, to indigent families.—So happily were
 "the nobility situated with regard to the peasants,
 "that they possessed the power to protect, *but*
 "*not to oppress*, them: all services and quit-rents
 "were fixed by positive laws and contracts. The
 "farmer, during the term of his lease, was as
 "much the master of his cottage, as the lord was
 "of his castle. If the one failed to fulfill the terms
 "of his contract, the other had his remedy by an
 "appeal to the courts of justice.—Rest assured,
 "that

“ that the feudal government existed in France
 “ no more than in England; that the relations
 “ subsisting between the vassal and his lord had
 “ nothing political in them; that the nobility pos-
 “ sessed not the means of tyrannising, (for tyranny
 “ implies power); and, that if the weak were some-
 “ times oppressed by the powerful, it was the effect
 “ of human perverseness, which exists alike in all
 “ countries, and did not, in the smallest degree, re-
 “ sult from the nature of the government.”

That you have been singularly unfortunate in the selection of your quotations, I have before shewn; but in no instance has this appeared more strongly, than in your choice of the province of Brittany as the scene of particular oppression. In that very province have the *tortured* peasants almost universally, risen, to support the cause of their *tyrannical oppressors*; and, rejecting the gift of *modern liberty*, have voluntarily exposed their lives, with a view to facilitate the resumption of *ancient shackles*. There, in the plains of *La Vendée*, have the banners of royalty been gallantly displayed; there, has the spirited resistance of the inhabitants to those who abolished the *dreadful* customs that constituted their *tortures*, cost the republic 210,000 lives, and thirty-seven millions* of money; and there thousands and tens of thousands have risen, bravely determined to restore the lawful constitution of their country, or gloriously to perish in the attempt: an attempt which your Lordship, with that accuracy of description by which your language is generally distinguished, terms “ The rebellion in

* Nine hundred millions of French livres—See the Count de Montgaillard's statements.

La Vendée," that is to say, the rebellion of royalty against perjury and treason, of honour against perfidy, and of religion against atheism.

The state of the French peasantry has been grossly misrepresented. If mirth, good humour, and social ease, may be considered as symptoms of felicity and content, where did they ever appear so strongly marked, so generally prevalent, as among this description of persons. Believe me, Goldsmith was a much better painter than your Lordship; *he* drew from *nature*; *you* draw from fancy and prejudice---*His* pictures exhibits the grace, without the fiction of poetry; *your* portraits retain the fiction, but reject the grace.

"To kinder skies, where gentler manners reign,
We turn; and FRANCE displays her bright domain;
Gay sprightly land of mirth and social ease,
Pleas'd with thyself, whom all the world can please,
How often have I led thy sportive choir,
With tuneless pipe, beside the murmuring Loire!
Where shading elms along the margin grew,
And freshen'd from the wave the zephyr flew:
And haply, tho' my harsh touch faltering skill,
But mock'd all tune, and marr'd the dancer's skill,
Yet would the village praise my wondrous power,
And dance, forgetful of the noontide hour.
Alike all ages: dames of ancient days
Have led their children through the mirthful maze,
And the gay grandsire, skill'd in gestic lore,
Has frisk'd beneath the burthen of threescore."

This is no fanciful picture; no offspring of the imagination; I have, myself, seen the original a hundred times!—

Before I dismiss the subject of your Lordship's *judicious* quotations from Mr. Young, I think it necessary to notice one flagrant misrepresentation, with which Mr. Young has not the smallest concern.

cern. You say, my Lord, "that the *works* of " Mr. Arthur Young, were recommended by Mr. " Reeves, and his association."—Now I affirm, that the works of Mr. Arthur Young were never recommended by Mr. Reeves, and his association. The only book written by Mr. Young, which they recommended, was, "*The example of France, a warning to Britain*," the publication of which I have ever considered as a kind of *amende honorable* for his political errors; and as a public recantation of the same. In this, I wish your Lordship would follow his example. But the association, most undoubtedly, never recommended the work from which you have made your quotations. On that subject, their opinion, I doubt not, perfectly corresponded with mine.

In contrasting the state of France, under the old government with that of England, you observe, that in the latter property was diffused, thereby intimating that there was no diffusion of property in France. But here again you betray a gross ignorance of the real situation of that country; for in several of the provinces, the law of primogeniture did not obtain, but, on the death of a proprietor, his property was equally divided among his heirs; and the consequence of this regulation was such, that in some parts of the kingdom, property was much more diffused than it is in England: in Champagne, for example, such was the diffusion of property, that in the vicinity of one village, ten thousand plots of ground appropriated to the cultivation of vines, were divided between no less than eighteen hundred proprietors.

Having exercised your ingenuity in drawing a most distinguished picture of France, you conceive this
this

this deformed offspring of your own imagination to have been adopted by the French, and thence draw this curious inference, "That all the different orders seemed to agree in the necessity of such alterations as virtually amounted to a dissolution of its existing government." Without attempting to reconcile such a declaration with your assertion, that the nobility and clergy insisted, in their instructions to their representatives, on the confirmation of all their ancient rights; and that the magistrates were equally fond of their consequence, and attached to their privileges, all of which most undoubtedly depended on the *preservation* of the existing government—I shall content myself with referring to authentic documents, in which sentiments diametrically opposite to those imputed by your Lordship to the higher orders of the state are publicly avowed by them. On the twenty-eighth of November, 1788, in a general committee of the nobles assembled at Versailles, the Prince of Conti delivered a note to the President, which was sanctioned by the concurrence of most of the other Princes of the blood, and was supposed to speak the general sense of the nobility; in which it was insisted, that the *proscription of all NEW SYSTEMS was necessary*, to ensure the stability of the throne, of the laws, and of order; and that the constitution, *with the ancient forms*, should be *preserved entire*.

Previous to this event, in a remonstrance presented to the King, by a body of the nobles and clergy, on the subject of his disputes with the parliaments, his Majesty was earnestly intreated, "To permit things to go on in that channel to which for ages they had been accustomed; and thereby to *prevent*

an alteration, which could not but entail the most ruinous consequences, both on the sovereign and the people."

In all the remonstrances presented by the parliaments to the King, during the same year, the magistracy professed an inviolable attachment to the laws of the realm, and "the essential principles of the constitution;" and the grand object of complaint with them was, the existence of a fixed system, "for the overthrow of the established government."

But nothing can supply a more positive contradiction to your Lordship's statement, than the *cahiers*, or instructions of the different orders to their representatives. M. de Calonne very justly observes, that nothing could be determined more unanimously, expressed more clearly, prescribed more imperatively, than the declarations contained in all the *cahiers*, of the necessity of *maintaining* the monarchical government in France, to the exclusion of every other species of government; and of supporting it by the preservation of those dependencies, which are essentially connected with it; and by an adherence to those maxims which are destined to secure it against all innovations.

"The constitution of the state," say the *cahiers* of the clergy, "results from the fundamental laws, "by which the respective rights of the King, and "of the nation are ascertained, and from which "not the smallest deviation can be made. The "first of these laws is, that the government of "France is purely monarchical.—The nation must "preserve inviolate, the form of its government, "which it acknowledges to be a pure monarchy, "regulated by the laws; and such it will have it "remain.

“ remain.—Let the ancient and fundamental laws
 “ of the realm be collected in a code, which shall
 “ secure to the nation, the permanence of its
 “ government, which is purely monarchical; and
 “ let no innovation be introduced, which can tend
 “ to destroy or alter its essence.—The monarchical
 “ form of government being the fixed and unshaken
 “ constitution of the nation, the best calculated to
 “ ensure its domestic tranquillity, and external
 “ safety; the best adapted to the extent of its pro-
 “ vinces, the most conformable to the character
 “ of its inhabitants, who, in all times, have been
 “ distinguished for their affection and attachment
 “ to their sovereigns, we will never consent to any
 “ regulation that can tend to alter the form of
 “ that government, to which we are inviolately at-
 “ tached, by the most sacred duties of obedience,
 “ by the obligation of oaths, and of fidelity, by our
 “ love and respect for our masters, and by the
 “ happiness we experience in being subjected to
 “ their sway, &c. &c.”

The nobility, in their cahiers, insist, that it shall
 be expressly and solemnly proclaimed, that the con-
 stitution of the French empire is such, that its
 government is, and must remain, monarchical;—
 that the King, as supreme chief of the French,
 is only subordinate to the fundamental law of the
 kingdom, according to which, the constitution
 must be established on the sacred and immutable
 principles of a monarchy, tempered by the laws;
 and this form of government cannot be replaced
 by any other institution.

The same language, and the same principles are
 to be found in the cahiers of the third estate.—
 They say,—“ Let our deputies, before they attend
 “ to

“ to any other object, assist in giving to France,
 “ a truly monarchical constitution, which must
 “ invariably fix the rights of the King, and of the
 “ nation.—Let it be declared, that the monarchical
 “ is the only form of government admissible in
 “ France;—that, in the King alone, as chief of
 “ the nation, is vested the power of governing
 “ according to the laws;—that the succession to the
 “ throne of France, from male to male, being
 “ acknowledged and confirmed by an express decla-
 “ ration, the solemn oath to maintain Louis the
 “ sixteenth, in the possession of all his rights,
 “ shall be renewed, &c. &c.*

I leave it to your Lordship’s constituents, and to the public to decide, whether this language indicates a spirit of *innovation*, and how far your Lordship was justified in declaring, “ That *all orders of the community* seemed to assent to this proposition, “ that such alterations as virtually amounted to a “ *dissolution of the existing government*, were necessary.” After my quotations from M. de Calonne’s work, it will scarcely be expected, that I should stop to disprove your assertion, that *he*, among others, was convinced of the necessity of a change.

But all that you have advanced, and indeed much more was necessary to prepare the credulity of your readers, for the reception of a dose infinitely more strong than any which you have hitherto administered,—the monstrous assertion, that the government of France “ *died a natural death, without exciting the lamentation of any*,” could only pro-

* De L’Etat de la France, présent et à venir. PP. 123, 124, 125, 126, *bis*.

ceed from the same man, who had pronounced the destruction of that government to be necessary to the security of England.

Do the crouds of emigrants which throng the towns of England, Italy, Russia, and the empire,---do the numerous battalions of French, gallantly fighting beneath the banners of the different powers at war with France,----do the martial bands whose heroic atchievements have immortalized their names, and who have gallantly maintained the cause of royalty, on the banks of the Loire,---do the slaughtered thousands in the fields of Flanders and Alsace, ---do the torrents of blood which have overflowed the plains of La Vendée,---do the countless numbers which have fallen beneath the axe of the guillotine, and by other republican engines of destruction,---do these bespeak the quiet transition of a *natural* death?---Do these indicate a *patient acquiescence* in the destruction of the monarchy?---Do these betray the feelings of resignation on an *unlamented* dissolution?---Or do they not rather resemble the violent struggles produced by those dreadful convulsions of nature, which strike the inhabitants of the earth with terror, and seem to threaten universal destruction? Indeed, my Lord, you trifle too much with the understandings of your readers; you insult too grossly the common sense of your constituents? you set the dictates of reason at defiance, and rise superior to the emotions of shame!

With that freedom which the occasion required, and of which the unqualified boldness of your assertions would alone afford a complete justification, I have shewn your observations on the old government of France, and the situation of its inhabitants, to be marked by ignorance, and fraught with errors.

I shall

I shall now direct my attention to remarks, some of which relate to the system established in France; and others to the measures of administration, and the conduct of their opponents in England.

The general tenour of your reasoning demonstrates a manifest intention to impress, on the minds of your readers, the conviction that the new rulers of France were ever amicably disposed towards this country. "The language, which upon all occasions they used," is affirmed to be a proof of this friendly disposition; and we are told that, "in forming a limited monarchy, France seemed to pay a just tribute to the wisdom of our constitution." That Lally-Tollendal, Clermont-Tonnerre, Mounier, and some others of the most enlightened, and best intentioned members of the moderate party in the constituent assembly, paid a just tribute of applause to the constitution of England is certain; but how the nation, by adopting a species of government, in which all those gradations of rank and power, which constitute the beauty and the chief excellence of *our* constitution, all those mutual checks which tend to prevent an undue preponderance in any of its component parts, and to render the discordant interests, and contending passions of individuals, subservient to the welfare and happiness of the community, were rejected with disdain; and in which, in short, little more of monarchy than the name was suffered to remain; how, I say, the adoption of *such* a government can be construed into a compliment to our own, it remains for your Lordship to explain. It must be confessed, too, that in their language, the popular leaders had a singular mode of expressing their admiration! Was the avowal, that the declaration of rights was intended to make *converts* of all mankind, a just tribute

tribute to the English constitution? * Is such a tribute meant to be conveyed in the declaration of a member of the assembly, that—" *The constitution of England has never protected nor preserved the constituting power of the people; the law there gives to the Prince, the absurd right of dissolving the Parliament at his pleasure, and that fatal ROYAL VETO, which caused the blood of the English to flow in the field of battle, and that of their King to be shed upon the scaffold?*" † Is it to be extracted from the debates on the question of establishing one or two chambers, speaking of which, M. de Lally-Tollendal observes—" From respect to my country, I will not repeat the *satires, which I heard pronounced upon that government* (of England) which were alike marked by ignorance of facts, and inconsistency of reasoning!" ‡ Is it contained in the *wise* observation of the Reverend Rabaud de St. Etienne--- that the English House of Peers was "a relic of the feudal government, which the French had proscribed; that it had not been originally adopted, either with a view to suspend the precipitate proceedings of the representatives of the people, or to repress the dangerous encroachment of the commons on the royal authority, but was simply a treaty of accommodation, a kind of capitulation between the pride of the great, and the

* See the debates of the Constituent Assembly on that subject.

† See the debates on the question of the *Veto* or *Royal Sanction*.

‡ *Memoire du Comte de Lally-Tollendal*, p. 136, 137.— M. de Lally's remark on the abuse of the English Government, in the Convention, may with justice be applied to your Lordship's observations on the old government of France; "*dans lesquelles l'ignorance des faits le dispute à l'inconsequence des raisonnemens.*"

“ spirit of liberty in the people ?” * Is it to be discovered in the preamble of the decree for the suppression of rank, which declares, that “ hereditary nobility cannot exist in a *free state* ?” Or is it to be found in the *sagacious* remark of your friend BRISOT, that *the English have no political liberty* ? †

If the sentiments which I have here noticed, were merely the sentiments of private individuals, I am aware, they would not tend to invalidate your observation ; but they were the sentiments of leading men, and were adapted by the prevailing party of the day, and by the majority of the national assembly, whose *friendly disposition* towards this country was evinced in the most unequivocal manner, both in word and deed, in their debates, and in their conduct, on our dispute with Spain, in the year 1790. ‡

If you had succeeded in your attempt to persuade your constituents that the French had ever been amicably disposed towards the English, during the

* See his speech on the question of the two chambers.

† See Brissot's speech at the Assembly of the *Friends of the Constitution*, on the subject of the King's deposal, in his own paper, LE PATRIOTE FRANCOIS, (of the 14th of July, 1791,) a paper which breathed treason, perjury, or rebellion, in every page.

‡ While this business was pending, M. Dupont, a member of the Assembly, published a pamphlet, entitled, “ Considerations on the Politics of France, Spain, and England,” in which he insisted that the court of France should summon that of England to disarm immediately, and that the *English nation* should be informed, that if she refused to comply, the French nation, swore, upon her honour, that she would instantly repair to London, in order to enforce a compliance with her proposals. “ The answer,” said he, “ must be prompt, for either England must begin to disarm in a week, or hostilities must commence in a month ! !” --- This is the man whom Dr. PARR somewhere calls “ the acute, the humane, and the elegant Mr. Dupont. !”

progress of their revolution, you might the more easily have induced them, perhaps, to give credit to your assertion, with respect to the war, which I shall now consider.

As to the advantages of peace, when contrasted with the evils of war, considered in a general point of view, without a reference to any particular case, there can be but one opinion. But though such advantages be sufficiently important to need no exaggeration, you are not content with stating them as they really are, but seek to extend them beyond the bounds either of reason or experience. You observe, that by preserving peace, we might have *monopolized* the trade of Europe. How this monopoly was to have been effected, it is rather difficult to conceive. If we had remained neuter, France would certainly have preserved her superiority at sea, over all her enemies, and would, of course, have been at liberty to extend her commerce to any part of the globe; while the possession of her Colonies in the East and West Indies, would have greatly facilitated the extension of her commercial operations. If she had been suffered to complete the reduction of Holland, the advantages, in point of trade, which would in that case have accrued to her, are too obvious to escape observation. But if, on the contrary, the preservation of Holland had been stipulated, as the condition of our neutrality, that country would, of course, have retained her portion of the European trade; Sweden, Denmark, and the other neutral powers, would also have come in for their share.— And though the trade of those nations who were at war with France might have been cramped, it certainly would not have been annihilated. It is

evident, therefore, that the *monopoly* could only exist in your own imagination. As far, indeed, as the interest of trade is concerned, the war will certainly be ultimately advantageous to us, since it has already enabled us completely to annihilate the commerce of our most formidable rival. This, however, where interests of so much greater importance are involved, is but a secondary consideration.

The real grounds of the war have been so fully and so ably discussed, independent of parliamentary investigation, by a learned and worthy friend of mine*, whose works I strenuously recommend to your Lordship's most serious consideration, as being calculated to give you that information of which you seem to stand in so much need—that nothing I can say on the subject can, I am persuaded, place them in a more striking point of view, or strengthen the arguments already adduced. But still, as you have thought proper, for reasons best known to yourself, to treat the subject, as if no such arguments had been advanced, I shall, in my comments upon your observations, be under the necessity of adverting to topics already discussed, and of using means of confutation already employed. These comments, however, shall be brief.—

The grand point, to the establishment of which all your arguments evidently tend is this,—That the French were universally anxious to avoid hostilities; and that the motives, alledged by the friends to the

* John Bowles, Esq. author of various tracts on the war, all of which display a depth of political knowledge, that bespeaks the most indefatigable attention to the subject, and a strength of argument that seems to beat down all resistance, and to set confutation at defiance.

war, in England, are insufficient to afford a justification of it.

That the French would have been glad to enforce an observance of neutrality on the part of England, in order that they might be enabled to accomplish, with less interruption, the dangerous schemes they had in view, will be easily credited. But they were inclined to purchase the continuance of peace with us, at the expence of those projects of ambition, which threatened the independence of every state in Europe, no man who is acquainted with the tenour of their conduct, subsequent to the abolition of monarchy, and has perused the correspondence between Lord Grenville and M. Chauvelin, can, if he be open to conviction, for a moment maintain.

If the French had been really disposed to preserve peace with England, on the only terms on which England could consistently with her own *safety*, consent to its continuance, the fairest opportunity they could desire was afforded them for so doing. The language of Lord Grenville was open, explicit, and unequivocal. He stated, as the condition of continued friendship, that France must shew a disposition "*to renounce her views of aggression and aggrandisement, and to confine herself within her own territories, without insulting other governments, without disturbing their tranquillity, without violating their rights.*" Were these demands unreasonable? Were they not such as it was the duty of ministers to enforce? A nation, actuated by fair and upright principles, could not, for an instant, have hesitated to comply with them in a direct and positive manner. But the answers of the French council were uniformly
evasive;

evasive; they invariably contained a reservation of the dangerous claim of a right to annul treaties, whenever, in their opinion, the new invented *rights of nature**, in other words, *their own interest* called for the exercise of such a right, and also to violate, at their pleasure, the rights of independent nations, in alliance with us. Our refusal to be satisfied with explanations that tended to justify, and not repair the injury complained of, was, by that nation, (every individual of which, in possession of any influence, is represented by your Lordship, as having been anxious to avoid hostilities,) considered as a sufficient basis on which to ground a declaration of war†

It

* *Nec natura potest justo discernere iniquum*

Dividit ut bona diversis, fugienda petendis.—HOR. SAT.

† It has frequently been insinuated that a refusal to open a communication with the French Minister was the means of preventing an accommodation which would otherwise have taken place. The insinuation is false in itself, and the inference drawn unfounded in fact. Though our monarch, very properly, refused to acknowledge M. Chauvelin in the new official capacity, which by a ready transfer of his allegiance from his Sovereign and *benefactor*, to the traitors who had hurled him from his throne, to the assassins who dragged him to the scaffold, he had assumed, yet that refusal did not operate as an impediment to a communication, which though non-official, was equally calculated to facilitate the means of accommodation.—The ground of complaint was formally specified—The satisfaction required clearly explained—and reparation for the injury positively refused. Thus every purpose of an official communication was completely answered. Had the French council been disposed to accommodate matters, every opportunity was allowed them for so doing. Our government not only displayed a willingness, but even an *eagerness*, to bring the points of dispute to an amicable termination. Of this the correspondence between Lord Grenville and Chauvelin affords a complete proof; which is farther corroborated by the instructions sent to Lord Auckland, at the Hague, to propose a conference with Dumourier, on the frontiers of Holland. (See *Dumourier's Letters to Miranda*, State papers, p. 246.—The whole business

It is evident, that the persons who had at that time assumed the reigns of power, expected that we should

business of this proposed conference, which is more fully explained by DUMOURIER, in his Memoirs, (from p. 143 to p. 163, Vol. I.) exhibits the profligacy of the French government, and the gross misrepresentations of your Lordship, in a most striking point of view. But if a contemplation of *these* be sufficient to excite our indignation, how much must that indignation be increased, when we consider the unprincipled conduct of the *present* French Minister for foreign affairs,—Talleyrand, the apostate bishop of Autun, who can boast of one honour in common with Brissot, that of the friendship of some of the leading members of the British opposition.—This man, in his letter to Lord Grenville, of the 14th of January, 1800 (a State-paper, for its impudence and falsehood, without a parallel in the annals of diplomacy) does not scruple to assert, respecting the war, that, on the part of the enemies to France, “*The aggression was real a long time before it was public: internal resistance was excited; its opponents were favourably received; their extravagant declamations were supported; the French nation was insulted in the person of its agents, and England set particularly this example, by the dismissal of the Minister accredited to her.*”—There is not one charge here preferred, which, if *applied to France*, is not perfectly just; nor is there one which applied to England or her allies, has even the shadow of truth to support it.—The *aggressive conduct of France*, long before the war, will be found sufficiently demonstrated in the subsequent pages of this tract; the *internal resistance excited* in foreign states by emissaries employed for the execution of Brissot’s patriotic plan for “setting the governed against the governors” may be traced to an early period of the revolution, when *the Club of the Propaganda* was established for the express purpose of diffusing revolutionary principles and exciting revolutionary practices throughout Europe; ---and that “*their opponents were favourably received; and their extravagant declamations were supported,*” is a fact notorious to every one who has read the debates of the different legislative assemblies, and who cannot but recollect the encouragement *officially* given to the seditious harangues of delegated traitors from the Jacobin clubs in the neighbouring countries, openly delivered at their bar.

But “the sublime genius” of the defenders of the French republic, from Mr. BARRISTER ERSKINE, down to CITIZEN TALLEYRAND, disdains to descend to the humble task of examining

should not tamely asquiesce in the insults offered to our allies and ourselves : for Brissot, whose authority you will not be inclined to dispute, has declared, " that as early as the month of October, the possibility of war with the maritime powers was

amining *dates* ; else the first minister of the first consul of the first nation in the world would not have ventured to assign as an instance of her aggression *a long time before the war*, the conduct of England, in the dismissal of Chauvelin, when it is known to all Europe, that Chauvelin did not receive orders to quit this kingdom, until after the news of the King's murder, (which took place on the 21st of January, 1793,) was received ; and that war was declared at Paris at the beginning of February ; nor would he have intimated that this *example* set by *England*, was followed by her allies, because those allies had been at war with France several months before, and consequently the only agents she could have in their dominions must have been spies, subject by the law of nations to be hanged.

But what are we to think of *Citizen Talleyrand's* declaration respecting this aggression of England, of his assertion, that " France was attacked in her independence, in her honour, and in her safety, *long time before the war was declared* ;" when we call to mind the testimony borne by this same man, to the honourable conduct of England towards France, so late as the month of December, 1792, when he was in this country, and when he informed the French government, that the British ministry " had nothing more at heart than to treat for the *preservation* of the neutrality ?" We must think that he is a proper Minister for the prince of assassins, *Bonaparte*, and a proper authority for Mr. *Barrister Erskine*, in his declamations respecting the origin of the war !

So anxious were the British Ministers for the preservation of peace, that they did not suffer the horror which they, in common with every honest man in Europe, experienced at the base and cowardly assassination of the virtuous Louis, to bar the avenues to negotiation—*After* that atrocious deed, they gave authority to *Lord Auckland*, to hold a conference with *Dumourier*, on the 10th of February, 1793—but the French government bent on hostilities, declared war before the day fixed for the meeting. (See *Dumourier's Memoirs*, *ubi supra*.) A more decisive proof of the pacific disposition of one party and the aggressive principles of the other could scarcely be required or afforded !

forseen

“ foreseen, and the diplomatic committee, and the
 “ committee of general defence, (of which Brissot
 was a member, and to which he acted as *reporter*,)
 “ had warned Monge the minister of marine of this
 “ circumstance. He was supplied with consider-
 “ able sums of money; he had promised to collect
 “ stores and provisions from all quarters, and to
 “ repair all the men of war and frigates; he had
 “ promised a fleet of thirty sail of the line, by the
 “ month of April, and fifty sail of the line by the
 “ month of July; he had promised to cover the
 “ sea with frigates for the protection of commerce,
 “ to send succours to St. Domingo, and Marti-
 “ nique; *an express law, passed in OCTOBER, en-*
 “ *joined this.*”---In another place, Brissot speaks
 still more plainly; he tells us, “THE DETERMI-
 “ NATION WAS MADE TO BRAVE ALL EU-
 “ ROPE*.”

I cannot here omit to remark, that as your Lord-
 ship was at Paris, at this particular juncture, (hav-
 ing reached that capital on the tenth of October,
 and not having left it till the first week in Decem-
 ber) and, of course, frequently saw Brissot, of
 your friendship with whom you have publicly *boast-*
ed, it is fair to presume that you were acquainted
 with his sentiments—unless indeed he was more re-
 served to you than he has been to the public—and
 must of course have known the impracticability of
 a continuance of peace, without an acquiescence,
 on our part, in projects of aggrandizement, calcu-
 lated to destroy the independence of every state in
 Europe.†

The

* Brissot's Address to his Constituents, P. 67.

† The circumstance of your acknowledged intimacy with
 Brissot, connected with your journey to Paris, at this critical
 juncture,

The declaration of war is an obstinate fact, which you cannot possibly subdue, but you seem strongly disposed to doubt the original aggression of France, and to ridicule the idea, "that the balance of power in Europe was destroyed, and that our allies, whom we were bound in honour and interest to defend, were in danger of being sacrificed to the ambition of the French republic, of the extent of which, even the recollection of Lewis the Fourteenth could furnish us with no idea."

I should have thought that the question of aggression had been fully decided by the confessions of the French themselves. You cannot be ignorant that the act of having involved the French nation in a war with England, was one of the crimes alledged against your friend Brissot on his trial; who retorted the charge upon the Robespierrean faction. Neither of these parties, who successively swayed the councils of France, before and after the war, and who were of course fully acquainted with every circumstance relating to it, ever pretended, at the time when all motives to misrepresent the conduct of England had ceased to exist, to charge our court with the aggression. It must be con-

juncture, renders it highly probable that you are the person alluded to in the following passage, which I have extracted from Brissot's Address to his constituents.

"*Fox said to an Englishman.* A FRIEND TO OUR PRINCIPLES AND TO OUR REVOLUTION: Let them be prevented from passing that sentence of death, (on the King,) and I will be answerable to you that there will be no war, that the opposition will prevail, that the nation will be with it; the enemies of France in the cabinet of St. James's want only that death to bring about a declaration of war."

The probability is certainly increased by the charge which your Lordship has preferred against Mr. Pitt, of having made an improper use of the murder of Louis the Sixteenth, with a view to influence the minds of members in favour of the war.

fessed

fessed, indeed, that those ministers have displayed a great want of gratitude to the advocates in this country, for they have supplied the most ample materials for confuting every argument which has been advanced in their favour.*

The decree of the nineteenth of November, 1792, held out, to the subjects of all foreign powers, an invitation to rebel in language too plain to admit either of misrepresentation or perversion.

“The National Convention declares in the name of the French nation, that they will grant *FRA-TERNITY and ASSISTANCE* to ALL PEOPLE *who wish to recover their liberty*; and they charge the Executive Power to send the necessary orders to the generals, to give assistance to such people, and to defend those citizens who have suffered, or may suffer, in the cause of liberty.”

That this invitation to the different nations of Europe might lose no part of its intended effect, it was, on the motion of one SERJEANT, resolved, that the decree “should be *translated and printed* in ALL LANGUAGES.” Brissot pronounced this decree to be “absurd and impolitic,” and declared that it “*very justly* excited uneasiness in foreign

* I have before me a Letter from the Continent, containing the sentiments of a most enlightened member of the National Assembly, and a most ardent friend to rational freedom, who had the fullest opportunity of ascertaining the real views and intentions of the early revolutionists, respecting this important question of aggression, which has been so recently revived. He says that the French were so notoriously the aggressors, that “he scarcely believes, that Mr. ERSKINE, or the opposition in England can credit their own representations:”—and he adds, what I have invariably maintained myself, that “the principles and intentions of the persons then in power in France, in respect of Europe, were, from the beginning, the same as we have seen them more openly display and exemplify of late—to revolutionize and republicanize all Europe.”

“cabinets,*” and even Mr. Grey himself has been compelled to acknowledge, that it “was, in a great measure, liable to the objections urged against it†” by our ministers.—In short, “if the decree of the 19th of November was an universal declaration of war, the explanation of that decree was an assertion of universal sovereignty‡.”

Did the French government, in the interval which elapsed between the nineteenth of November, and the final departure of M. Chauvelin from England, evince a disposition to remove the well-founded alarms experienced by our court, by a repeal of the decree which had given rise to them. They did indeed deny that it would bear the interpretation which we had given it, but their own conduct, at the time, gave the lie direct to their assertions. It would be difficult, I apprehend, to produce, from the annals of any nation, a more gross contradiction between the professions and practice of a government, a more perfidious violation of truth and good faith, than that by which, in this instance, their conduct was distinguished.

In the pursuit of the principles promulgated by the decree of the 19th of November, the national convention passed another decree, on the *fifteenth* of December, by which their generals were ordered to regulate their conduct, in the countries which their armies then occupied, or might afterwards occupy.|| In the preamble to this decree they expressly

* Brissot's Letter to his Constituents, p. 63.—of the translation.

† See his proposed Address to the King on the 21st of Feb. 1793, which was negatived without a division—*Debrett's State-Papers*, p. 377.

‡ Real grounds of the war, p. 21.

|| Mr. Fox has, since this Letter was written, once ventured to assert in the house (if the Parliamentary Reports be correct) that

pressly declared, *that their principles would not permit them to acknowledge any of the institutions militating against the sovereignty of the people*; and the various articles exhibit a complete system of demolition: They insist on the immediate *suppression of all existing authorities, the abolition of rank and privileges* of every description; and the *suppression of all existing imposts*. Nay, these friends to freedom even declare they will treat as enemies *a whole nation* (un peuple entier) which shall presume to reject liberty and equality, or enter into a treaty with a prince, or privileged Casts!—It is worthy of remark, that *the very day* on which this decree, containing a systematic plan for disorganizing all lawful governments, passed the assembly, the provisional executive council wrote to their agent, Chauvelin, instructing him to disavow all hostile intentions on the part of France, and to

that the decree in question was repealed. But the fact is, that to this moment, (Jan. 1800) it remains a part of the law of the French Republic. Mr. Fox's assertion, strange to say! was suffered to pass without contradiction; it served, however, to shew that he attached a proper degree of importance to the existence of that decree, as it affected the question of aggression, the origin, and continuance of the war.—General Dumourier, who was at Paris at the close of the year 1792, and during the first month of the subsequent year, aware of the just grounds of alarm which the decree afforded to all other states, exerted himself to procure its revocation, or, at least, to obtain a limitation of its provisions to countries at war with France; but, as this would have defeated its object, which was, and still is, to excite insurrection throughout Europe, the efforts of the General proved abortive, and the decree now remains in the revolutionary code, exhibiting to the world a memorable record of the destructive principles of the French Republic, and an instrument ready to be called into action, whenever, by an insidious peace, or a successful war, her power may be rendered commensurate with her views.

proclaim

proclaim her detestation of the idea of a war with England * . . . —The language of the decree of the 15th of December, like that of the preceding decree, is too plain to be misunderstood. But, as there are persons ever disposed to exert their ingenuity in palliating the conduct of the French, however unjust, I cannot but consider it as a fortunate circumstance for the historian, that we are in possession of authentic documents on the subject of this decree, which preclude the possibility of misinterpretation. These documents are the general instructions of the provisional executive council to the national commissioners in the Netherlands, chosen by themselves, conformably to the decree; and a particular account of the conduct of these commissioners, in consequence of these instructions, published by one of them. In the instructions every article of the decree is repeated, and comments are subjoined to each, explanatory of its spirit, and tending to direct its practical application.†

In

* See Chauvelin's Letter to Mr. Pitt—*Debrett's State-Papers*, p. 223.

† An additional proof, that the Executive Council only intended to amuse the British Ministry, and were firmly resolved to carry all their destructive projects into execution, may be found in an official Letter from Monge, a member of the Council, and one of those members who opposed the proposition of Dumourier to meet the overtures which the English Government had made for a pacific negotiation. (See Dumourier's *Mémoires*, p. 145 of the translation.)

“The Government of England is arming, and the King of Spain, encouraged by this, is preparing to attack us. These two tyrannical powers, after persecuting the Patriots in their own territories, think, no doubt, that they shall be able to influence the judgment to be pronounced on the traitor Louis. They hope to frighten us: but, no; a people who has made itself free; a people who has driven out of the bosom of

In their preliminary observations, the council remark, that “ although the art of organizing societies be still in its infancy, the art of organizing revolutions is farther advanced—thanks to that vast experience which we have obtained at our own expence, and for the benefit of mankind.”

After exhorting the commissioners to diffuse French principles among the people, by the circulation of pamphlets, composed for the purpose, by the encouragement of patriotic societies and of all establishments consecrated to the propagation of freedom, the council promise to transmit them lists of citizens, in the different countries to which they may be sent, known for their patriotic sentiments, and the most capable of assisting the commissioners in the discharge of their duty. Your Lordship will, at least, acknowledge that they would have had little difficulty in making out such a list for England.

“ As to what concerns the suppression of *existing imposts*”—say these legislators for the universe—“ to be proclaimed with that of all op-

of France, and as far as the distant borders of the Rhine, the terrible army of the Prussians and Austrians—the people of France will not suffer laws to be dictated to them by any tyrant.

“ The King and his Parliament mean to make war against us. Will the English Republicans suffer it? Already these freemen shew their discontent, and the repugnance which they have to bear arms against their brothers, the French. Well! we will fly to their succour. We will make a descent on the Island: we will lodge there Fifty Thousand Caps of Liberty: we will plant there the sacred Tree, and we will stretch out our arms to our REPUBLICAN BRETHREN. The *tyranny of their Government will soon be destroyed*. Let every one of us be strongly impressed with this idea.—*Extract of a Letter from the Minister of Marine to the Sea Ports, dated Paris 31st December, 1792.*

(Signed)

MONGE.”

“ pressive

“pressive rights” (in which tithes, quit-rents, &c. are included) “this measure is similar to that which was adopted by the representatives of the French people, at the time when they constituted themselves a national assembly in 1789. That measure was indispensably necessary to characterize the absolute regeneration of the social system, of which the contributions constitute an essential basis, and to signalize the resumption of the sovereign rights of the people, from which the right of imposing taxes is a primitive emanation.”

The third article of the decree excludes, from the primary and other assemblies of the people, and from the office of administrator or provisional judge, all persons who have not previously taken the oath of “liberty and equality,” and delivered in a written renunciation of all the privileges and prerogatives, abolished by the decree.—In their comments on this article, the council enjoin the commissioners to convince the people “that a revolution, in which agents should be employed who were enemies to equality, and which should not produce the destruction of all privileges, would soon become a vain political convulsion, a source of ruinous agitation and of bloody discord.”—

The fourth article provides for the seizure of all property belonging to the church and state—and the commissioners are told that “the executive council depend upon the celerity and precipitation of their measures for the immediate execution of this *important mandate*.”

The sixth article declares, “that as soon as the provisional administration shall be organized, the national convention shall appoint some of its own members, as commissioners to fraternize
“with.

“*with it.*”—This power of fraternizing is called by the council—“a moral power, whose influence “is rendered more extensive by the impossibility of “its ever being perverted.”

In their comments on the seventh article, by which the generals of the republic are enjoined to employ the resources of the country occupied by their armies for supplying the troops with every thing they may want, and for paying them, the council, alluding to the estates of which the republic had robbed the lawful proprietors, observe, “sooner should the whole world be overturned, “than the security for our assignats be restored “to those from whom we have taken it.”—The commissioners are ordered—to enforce the circulation of assignats in the countries occupied by the French armies, and to procure money in exchange for assignats *at Par!* In the means advised to be pursued for this purpose, the consequence attached to the diffusion of assignats, as an essential support of the *revolutionary system*, is displayed in a strong point of view.

The council boast of the *disinterested conduct* of the French republic, in declaring (in the ninth article of the decree) that the provisional administration and the functions of the national commissioners shall cease, as soon as the inhabitants—after having declared the sovereignty and independence of the people, *liberty and equality*---shall have organized a free and popular form of government. They say, that the object of the convention was to *protect and liberate* the people. But the eleventh article affords a complete contradiction to such professions; it demonstrates the true principles by which their conduct was influenced, and plainly proves, that so far from leaving the people free to chuse for themselves, they were resolved to impose

on them such a form of government as best suited the interested and ambitious views of the French republic.

Article 11th—The French nation declares, “*that she will treat as enemies the people who refusing or renouncing liberty and equality, are desirous of preserving, recalling, or entering into an accommodation with, their Prince and privileged Casts*; she promises and engages to sign no treaty, and not to lay down her arms, until the sovereignty and independence of the people, on whose territory the troops of the republic shall have entered, and who shall have adopted the principles of equality, and established a free and popular government, shall be secured.” According to this decree—say the council---the French nation considers as her enemies, *even a whole people*, if they refuse liberty and equality, and express a wish to treat with a prince and privileged Casts.—This, and the subsequent declarations of the council, amount to an explicit and unequivocal acknowledgement, that the object of the war, on the part of France, is the extirpation of every existing government in Europe, that is not founded on the principles of equality.---The following are the declarations to which I allude.

“The declaration and the engagement which this article contains are *not a vain threat* and an illusory promise; they are, on the contrary, the direct consequences of all the principles on which the *just and salutary law*, decreed by the convention, is founded.

“On the one hand, it is evident that a people so fond of their chains, so obstinately wedded to their degradation, as to refuse to be restored to all
“their

“ their rights, are the accomplices not only of their
 “ own despots, but even of all the crowned usurp-
 “ ers, who divide among themselves the dominion
 “ of the earth and of its inhabitants ; that so ser-
 “ vile a people are the declared enemies, not only
 “ of the French republic, but also of every other
 “ nation : that thus the distinction, so justly estab-
 “ lished by us between the governments and the
 “ people, ought not to be observed in favour of
 “ such a people ; in a word, that the right of natu-
 “ ral defence, the duty of securing the preserva-
 “ tion of our liberty, and the success of our arms,
 “ the universal interest of restoring to Europe a
 “ peace WHICH SHE CANNOT OBTAIN BUT BY
 “ THE ANNIHILATION OF THE DESPOTS AND
 “ THEIR SATELLITES,”---anglicè, kings and no-
 “ bles---“ every thing imposes on us the obligation
 “ of exercising, towards such a people, all the ri-
 “ gours of war and the rights of conquest ; and,
 “ consequently, of depriving them of all their re-
 “ sources, which, if left in their hands, would
 “ sooner or later be rendered subservient to the
 “ hostile views of those powers who now wage war
 “ against us—a war as criminal in its motive, as it
 “ it is barbarous in its means.”

“ On the other hand, the people who shall re-
 “ ceive the French, and generously embrace the
 “ liberty which they bring with them, from that
 “ moment become their ally ; they partake of their
 “ dangers, and share in their hopes ; they march
 “ together in pursuit of one common object ; such
 “ a people and the French nation shall in fu-
 “ ture fight, die, or conquer, in conjunction with
 “ each other, the solid league of despots and of
 “ slaves who are armed equally against them both.

“ Thus, if ever there were a sure engagement,
 “ *an irrevocable promise*, it is that which the
 “ French nation now makes, to consider the inde-
 “ pendency of such a people as her own, and to
 “ sacrifice every thing in order to preserve them
 “ from the attempts of despotism and aristocracy.
 “ Thus in the countries occupied by the troops of
 “ the republic, let no man presume to doubt the
 “ accomplishment of that promise, let every one
 “ implicitly confide in the French nation, and ex-
 “ ert his utmost efforts to promote the sublime
 “ interest of *universal liberty*.

“ Such are the truths which the national com-
 “ missioners are to promulgate, and to impress on
 “ the minds of all men. On this does the success
 “ of their mission essentially depend; and *on that*
 “ *success, in a great measure, depends the salva-*
 “ *tion of the republic.*”

To complete the profligate hypocrisy of the French government, the very day on which these instructions were signed by the executive council.—The eighth of January, 1793, was the day chosen by Monsieur Le Brun, one of the members who subscribed them, to write to Lord Grenville, a paper, in which he declares that France, “ *will*
 “ *know how to respect other governments,*” and
 “ *that she does not wish to impose laws upon any*
 “ *one**.”

In the same paper, M. Le Brun, who was then minister for the foreign affairs, lays it down as a principle, that the French republic, in her transactions with foreign nations, makes the general will of the people, composing such nations, the inviolable rule of her conduct. And he particularly

* Debrett's state papers, p. 241.

states, that the offensive decrees of which England had complained, were only meant to apply to those cases in which the general will of a people was expressed. Without remarking on the folly of supposing that a whole people, unopposed by foreign powers, could want the assistance of the French armies, in regulating their internal concerns, I shall, by an extract from a letter from Publicola Chaussard, *Commissaire du pouvoir executif*, one of the French commissioners in the Netherlands, to M. Le Brun, dated the 30th of January, 1793, giving an account of his operations, in pursuance of the instructions he had received, prove the said Le Brun to be one of the most impudent dealers in falshood, which even the fertile soil of the French republic had yet produced.

“All the documents we received,” (from their subaltern agents, who had been sent to the Netherlands before the commissioners) “agreed in representing the provisional administration,” (which had been chosen *by the people*) “as containing a majority *hostile to the decree of the 15th of December*. This is proved by a protest entered in the registers of the council. Tis true, the protest has since been expunged; but the principles on which it was founded were too deeply engraven on their hearts, to be effaced at the same time. Another proof, is their obstinate refusal to render their sittings public; and the dread, the agitation which they seem to experience at the sight of a *principle of the law of nature*.”

“These considerations, at first, determined us to dissolve the administration, and by such a bold stroke becoming a revolutionary power, to beat down

“down factions, and annihilate them by the means of terror.

“A provisional commission named by us, “*perpetually under our hands, and under our influence*, would have immediately replaced the administration, and have corresponded with our movements, during the formation of the Primary Assemblies.”

This patriotic commissioner then states his reasons for thinking that the adoption of such a measure might have proved detrimental to the cause of the republic, and for having recourse to another mode of proceeding, by which, without the appearance of force, the same end would be accomplished, “the minority raised up, and the ascendancy of an *anti-patriotic majority* be destroyed, or, at least, counterbalanced.”

It is needless to explain the sense in which the epithet here applied to the majority is used; a disposition, hostile to the decrees of the convention, however hostile these might be to the real interests of the Netherlands, was a crime not to be forgiven by a French commissioner, whose utmost exertions were employed to secure the sovereignty of these countries to the French republic. Had the English ministers suffered themselves to be duped by the declarations of Le Brun, contradicted as they are by official documents, signed by himself, and by the declarations and conduct of his agents, acting in pursuance of his instructions, they would have richly deserved all the evils which your Lordship wishes may befall them, for *not* having done so.

I shall now prove that those projects of ambition, which were imputed to the French, and the consequent destruction of the balance of power, were

were not so imaginary as you seem anxious to have it thought they were. And, thanks to that spirit of party, which your Lordship so much admires, I am enabled to derive my proofs from the declarations of the French themselves. The first evidence I shall produce is your friend Brissot—in his address to his constituents, after declaring that “it is time that *truth* should be shewn stark-naked,”—he laments the conduct of some of the members of the convention, who had, by their rashness, in a great measure, defeated his plans; by the accomplishment of which, he tells us, —*Liberty might easily have found no other boundaries than those of the world**. In another place, we are told that the unpunished crimes of Marat, and the massacres of the second of September, (for which be it observed, Brissot himself had paved the way,) “have put back *the universal revolution of mankind for whole ages†*” Again, “*We, who should no longer know any barrier, except the Rhine*, have been obliged to abandon those brothers to whom we have given liberty. The evacuation of Belgium has obliged *the liberty of Europe to lose ground‡*.” I have before shewn what species of liberty it was that the French destined for the Belgians.

The following extract, the last I shall quote on the subject from Brissot, explains, in very few words, the real object of all the plans and pursuits of the French government. “What did enlightened republicans wish before the tenth of August, men who wished for liberty, *not only for their own country, BUT FOR ALL EUROPE? They*

* Translation, p. 9.

† p. 30.

‡ p. 71.

“believed

“believed that they could generally establish it, by
 “exciting the governed against the governors, in
 “letting the people see the facility and the advantages of such insurrections*” And yet M. Le Brun, Brissot’s friend, and one of his party, could have the impudence to tell Lord Grenville, that
 “it would be *wronging the national convention*, if
 “they were charged with the project of protecting
 “insurrections†.”

My next evidence is *Publicola Chaussard*, who being *commissioner of the executive power*, was, of course, thoroughly acquainted with the plans, views, and intentions of the French government.

“It was of consequence to France, that she
 “should re-possess herself on one side of the barrier of the Rhine, and on the other, command
 “the Scheldt and the Meuse, by enclosing them
 “within her boundaries; thus protecting and enlarging the sources of the national wealth; in a
 “word, that she should resume the antient division
 “of her territory, which heretofore extended northern Gaul to these limits, that she should bring
 “back into the bosom of a vast family, nations,
 “that during a long space of time, made a part
 “of it: nations, successively subject to the domination of the Franks, to that of the Kings of the
 “first race, and to the sway of the counts of Flanders.”

“No doubt it was the interest of France, to raise
 “and to secure by conquest, the trade of the
 “Belgic provinces, so cramped by that of Holland;
 “and thence to alarm, to threaten the United Provinces, to place our assignats on the very desks

* p. 74.

† Debrett’s state papers, p. 239.

“ of their counting-houses, *there to ruin the Bank*
 “ *of England*; and, in short, to complete the re-
 “ volution of the money system. It was the inte-
 “ rest of France to monopolize, as it were, these
 “ vast implements of trade, these manufactures of
 “ national prosperity. It was the interest of France
 “ to weaken her mortal enemy, to cramp his efforts,
 “ to aggrandize herself with his spoils; in brief, to
 “ mutilate the colossus of Austria, by rending from
 “ him these fertile countries, for obtaining and se-
 “ curing the possession of which, he has, for ages,
 “ been lavish of gold, of blood, and of intrigues.

“ It was the interest of France to raise herself to
 “ the rank of a first-rate power in Europe; thus
 “ covering with her shield the second-rate powers,
 “ and protecting them against the boundless ambi-
 “ tion of the northern empires *.”

“ —The local situation of countries necessarily
 “ influence the political connection of their inha-
 “ bitants. Nature has herself proscribed their
 “ limits, which are rivers, mountains, and seas.
 “ In vain has man destroyed the work of nature;
 “ in vain has the rage for conquest, or the fury of
 “ hostile invasions, effaced these primitive boun-
 “ daries. Woe be to him, who shall prefer the
 “ authority of history to the authority of reason!
 “ *The treaties of Kings are annihilated*,—the com-
 “ pact of nations is forming.†”

“ England and Prussia know very well, that
 “ France has the greatest interest to substitute a
 “ popular and representative government for the
 “ aristocratical and degenerate one that actually

* *Memoires historiques et politiques sur la Revolution de la Belgique et du pays de Liège. Par Publicola Chaussard, p. 15. and 17..*

† *Idem, p. 413.*

“ exists in Holland, *that with the forces of that*
 “ *country, France would irrecoverably destroy the*
 “ *trade of England*, and by means of her navy,
 “ soon command the Baltic ; that all which would
 “ be wanting, would be a renewal, in that part of
 “ the north, of an alliance of situation then be-
 “ come necessary ; and that *an intimate union be-*
 “ *tween France and Holland, being once formed,*
 “ *the supremacy of the English trade, both in the*
 “ *East and West Indies, would rapidly disappear ;*
 “ while Prussia, on her side, would, sooner, or later,
 “ irrecoverably lose all her possessions in *West-*
 “ *phalia.*”†

“ The enemies of France, and England in parti-
 “ cular, cherish the system of excluding her from
 “ ranking as a maritime power. Thence proceeded
 “ the error in which the public opinion was kept,
 “ respecting our operations in Flanders, *and those*
 “ *which we had projected against Holland.* The
 “ patriot delights to dwell on those combinations
 “ which raise the predominance of his country,
 “ since that predominance *is only exercised for the*
 “ *happiness of mankind.* And if some senseless
 “ powers wish to re-establish an eastern or a western
 “ empire, why should not France resume her
 “ former extent of territory, when chance renders
 “ the accomplishment of such a measure practica-
 “ ble. Why should she wait to obtain that from
 “ the lassitude of her enemies, which she is able to

† This is part of a speech of Maulde-Hosdan, formerly Minister Plenipotentiary from France to Holland, delivered in the Convention, by which it was approved, and quoted by Chaussard, in support of his own sentiments, P. 277, note.—Maulde was formerly a Colonel in the French army, and was employed to open a personal communication between Lord Auckland and General Dumourier.

“ procure

“ procure by her own strength? Why should she
 “ have recourse to alliances for the establishment
 “ of a power which she can herself, without assist-
 “ ance, create?---Apply this to Talleyrand’s late
 “ note.

“ Become inaccessible, in some measure, by such
 “ an accession of power, surrounded by seas, chains
 “ of mountains, and a vast river presenting, by
 “ land, more numerous armies than Germany, and,
 “ by sea, more numerous fleets than the rest of the
 “ maritime powers, France would receive the law,
 “ from no nation, and would *force all Europe* to
 “ make a peace.*

“ *A war AD INTERNECIONEM is declared be-*
 “ *tween the republic and monarchies.* Austria be-
 “ ing once subdued, the Germanic body may be-
 “ come a colossus of federative republics, and change
 “ the system of the north.”

I think it needless to make a single comment on these quotations. But as the same principle, avowed by Chaussard, in 1793, appears to have obtained in the convention in 1794, when the president, in reply to an address from the Sections of Paris, observed, “ This is a war to last till death between republicans and Kings,”† I recommend it to the serious attention of his Grace of Bedford, Mr. Grey, and such members of both Houses, as support these juvenile leaders of the minority, in their efforts to enforce the adoption of measures which tend ultimately to invigorate the exertions of our enemies, and to ex-

* Chaussard, P. 278, 279.

† For an ample display of this point, as well as a complete illustration of *that* right of interference in the affairs of France to which I shall presently allude. See “Objections to the continu-
 “ ance of the war, examined and refuted,” by John Bowles, Esq.

pose us, in the mean time, to the degradation of making pacific propositions, to which the French have repeatedly and solemnly declared they will never accede.*

In

* On the thirteenth of April, 1793, the Convention passed a solemn decree declaring it a capital crime, for a man to propose to treat with any power that should not have previously acknowledged the independence of the French nation, and *the unity and indivisibility* of the republic, founded on liberty and equality. By one of the articles of the Constitution of the 10th of August, 1793, France declared, that she would not make peace with an enemy who occupied any part of her territory. Barrere, in his speech of the 22d of January, 1794, which was received by the convention with great applause, said—"In a war for freedom, there is but one means, that of EXTERMINATING DESPOTS. —When the horrors of tyranny, and the instinct of freedom, have armed the brave, *they will only sheath the sword by dictating peace.*" After reprobating, in strong terms, the idea of listening to proposals for peace, he concluded thus,—“Who is it that calls for peace? Brunswick, Cobourg, Pitt, Hood, and Ricardos. The deceit is too gross, for it is our cowardly enemies themselves, who industriously propagate this opinion, and who *have the folly to hope it will prevail!*” The convention has sanctioned the principles of Barrere, by passing a resolution, not to conclude a peace with the people of England, until they shall have detached themselves from their infernal government!!!

It is almost needless to observe, that whoever acknowledges the unity of the republic, must consent to leave France in possession of Avignon, and the Comtat Venaissin, which she wrested from the Pope, and of Savoy, which she has detached from the dominions of the Sardinian monarch, and annexed to her own territory, in direct contradiction to the decree by which the constituent assembly virtually announced all conquests, and to the positive declarations of the French Ministry, to Lord Grenville, in which such renunciation was expressly renewed.

But your party profess to wish only for the conclusion of an *honourable* peace. Let them attend to what Tallien says on that subject, in his speech of the 14th of last November. “Now, when our brave brethren in arms, conquerors on the Rhine, are forcing *tottering thrones* to bow before the Majesty of the French people, to sue for a peace, *which can be honourable only to the latter*; now that France can, by ridding herself of part of her enemies, carry the glory of her arms to the banks of the
“Thames,

In order to prove that, however, the different parties in France, might disagree, on objects of internal regulation, the sentiments of all parties, on the question of aggrandizing the republic, by the subjugation of foreign states, have been in perfect unison, I shall shew what was the opinion of the chief leaders of the Jacobin faction on this subject.

ROBESPIERRE, lamenting that the projected operations against Holland, alluded to by Chaussard, had not been put in execution, says, "If we had invaded Holland, we should have become masters of the Dutch navy, the wealth of that country would have been blended with our own; her power added to that of France, the government of England would have been undone, *and the revolution of Europe secured.*"*

CAMILLE DESMOULINS, in his history of the Brissotines, says, "To create the French Republic; *to disorganize Europe; perhaps, to purge it of its tyrants,* by the eruption of the volcanic prin-

"Thames, and *destroy the English government.*—With the assistance of the Dutch and Spanish ships, *we will repair with vigour to the banks of the Thames, and destroy the new Carthage.*"

* In the first edition, I had here introduced an extract from a publication which appeared in the year 1794; entitled, "*Rapport fait par Saint-Just, au Comité de Salut Public, à Paris, au mois de Mai, 1794, Relativement aux Dépenses faites pour les puissances neutres.*" But I have since discovered that report to be a forgery; and I eagerly embrace the first opportunity which has occurred, posterior to such discovery, to proclaim it to the world. The Count D'Antraigues was the author of this pamphlet; which he took care to render strictly conformable to the known sentiments and principles of the person whose report it professed to be. But it is not the less reprehensible on this account. Such an act cannot be too strongly reprobated; and its consequences have a direct tendency to injure the very cause which they were meant to serve,

"ciples

“ ciples of equality; to indemnify Paris for her
 “ losses, by placing her *between the mouths of the*
 “ *Rhine and the Rhone* ; and giving her a maritime
 “ commerce,--such was the sublime vocation of the
 “ convention.”

And even since the destruction of the Jacobins, and the consequent restoration of the *moderate* party, the same principles of aggrandizement continue to influence the rulers of France as is evident from the report of Cambaceres, from the committee of public safety, to the convention, on the third of March, 1795, in which “ the Alps, “ the Pyrenees, and the two seas,” are represented as the natural boundaries of the republic.

I defy you, my Lord, to produce, from the history of existing nations, a system of aggrandizement, alike pregnant with danger to foreign states, either in respect to the immense preponderance of power which its accomplishment must inevitably establish, or of the diabolical means used to promote its success. I have proved, that this system was confined to no particular party ; it was the basis of the operations of all parties ; it was adopted by the Brissotines ; it was pursued by the followers of Robespierre ; and was alike the delight and the boast of *moderates* and *Jacobins* : nay, the insidious means, by which the former intended to execute their plans of ambition, were even more dangerous than the open outrage and undisguised violence of the latter. Professions of moderation from men who have planned the subversion of all existing governments, and the complete disorganization of the social system, are like the voice of the syren, that allures but to deceive, and deceives but to destroy. These considerations lead
 me

me to make some remarks on your Lordship's avowed predilection for Brissot and his party, who have, since the downfall of the monarchy, been generally distinguished by the appellation of *moderates*.

Though I am not disposed to extend the principle founded on the ancient maxim, *noscitur ex sociis*,* as far as it might, even with propriety, be carried; I must nevertheless contend, that a declared friendship between public characters, especially in critical times, when the spirit of party runs high, implies a congeniality of political sentiments†. Leaving the application of this remark to your constituents, and only availing myself of the right, which every Englishman possesses, of discussing, with freedom, the public conduct of men in a public station; and the propriety of any connections which have a necessary influence on such conduct; I shall observe that the boast you made in the British senate, of your friendship for Brissot, in the situation of public affairs at that period, was neither decent, nor such as could afford you a claim to the confidence or esteem of any true friend to this country.

The delineation of Brissot's character I shall reserve for a work in which it will appear to greater

* I could wish your Lordship would apply to the erudite Author of the "Preface to Bellendenus" to fix the precise line beyond which the application of this maxim should not be allowed to extend. We might then learn from authority, founded on the best of all bases, EXPERIENCE, how far a constant association with JACOBINS should be admitted as a proof of *Jacobinism*.—I could adduce such a case—directly in point—such an argumentum *ad hominem*, aye and *ad rem* too—as would compel acquiescence in the most reluctant, and extort belief from the most incredulous;——but I forbear.—

† Cicero particularly states a difference of political sentiment, to be one of the causes which lead to the destruction of friendship.—*Ut de Republicâ non idem sentirent*—De Amicitia, cap. 10.
advantage.

advantage. A few traits, however, will suffice to demonstrate the justness of my observation.—

Brissot, after taking a solemn oath to *maintain the Constitution*, as established by the constituent assembly; and to obey the nation, the *law*, and the *King*, devised, and successfully executed, a plan, for the abolition of that constitution, the violation of that law, and the deposition of that King.—

Brissot was therefore a **PERJURED TRAITOR** *.—

Brissot maintained that the English had no political liberty; that their nobility, clergy, and men of property, lived only by abuses; that their professions of attachment to their sovereign betrayed a *most scan-*

* It is not one of the least striking of those circumstances, which mark the extreme depravity of the French republicans that the atrocious crime of perjury is so far eclipsed, as it were, by more glaring and horrid enormities, as scarcely to be noticed by their enemies, and as not to be deemed by their friends worth the trouble of a justification or excuse. What a contrast does the conduct of this degenerate people exhibit with that of the ancient Romans, whom they affect so much to admire? The latter ever regarded an oath as sacred, and frequent instances occur in their history, in which, though deaf to the calls of patriotism, they fulfilled, with a religious scrupulosity, the obligations imposed on them by an oath. Under the consulate of Quintus Cincinnatus, the attempt to raise an army in Rome, for the attack of two neighbouring states, was strenuously opposed by the tribunes, when the Consul, addressing himself to the people, exclaimed—"Let all those who took the oath to the consuls of the last year," (to follow them to the field) "follow me." In vain did the tribunes exclaim that the people were no longer bound by oath; that, when they took it, Quintus was a private individual: the people were more religious than those who pretended to guide them; and they alike rejected the distinctions, and the interpretations, of their tribunes.

After the battle of Cannæ, the people, who were in the utmost consternation at the defeat of their army, evinced a determination to retire into Italy; but Scipio having exacted from them an oath that they would remain at Rome, the dread of violating their oath surmounted every other apprehension.—Many other instances of this kind might be adduced.

alous

dalous idolatry for royalty; that their minister was *the agent of despotism* *, and their monarch a *tyrant* †, Brissot was therefore a *base calumniator*.

Brissot devised the means of promoting an universal insurrection throughout Europe; he wrote a book, to prove *the right of the people to revolt* ‡; and declared that the end of *all* his labours, and of which he never lost sight, was *the universal emancipation of mankind* ||. Brissot was therefore an *enemy to every existing government and to social order*. Brissot, in his speech of the 12th of January, 1793, adverting to the censures passed by the English on the conduct of the French to the Belgians, said—"Did we enter these provinces to make a constitution? Let the following instructions given to our generals be perused—*assemble the people—consult their wish—protect their safety while they deliberate on that wish—and respect it when it shall be expressed---*such is our *tyranny!---**We plunder Belgia! we have simply wished to be VOLUNTARILY reimbursed for the expences of a war---incurred in the restoration of liberty to our neighbours.---*"

In his Address to his Constituents---he says---
 "how could the Belgic people believe themselves
 "free, *since we exercise for them, and over them, the*
 "rights of sovereignty, when, *without consulting them,*
 "we suppress, in a mass, all their ancient usages,
 "their abuses, their prejudices? How could they

* See Brissot's report to the convention, on the 12th of Jan. 1793.

† See his speech in the convention, on the declaration of war.

‡ See his life, written by himself.

|| I scarcely need observe, that in the language of the revolution, *universal emancipation*, and *universal revolt*, are synonymous terms.

“believe themselves free and sovereign, when *we*
 “*made them take such an oath as we thought fit,*
 “as a test to give them the right of voting—when
 “openly despising their religious worship we pro-
 “scribed their priests; *when we seized their reve-*
 “*nues, their domains, and riches, to the profit of the*
 “*nation; when we carried to the very censer those*
 “*hands which they regarded as profane?*

“Do you believe the Belgians have ever been
 “the dupes of those well-rounded periods, which
 “were *vended* in their pulpits, *in order to familia-*
 “*rize them with the idea of an union with France?*
 “Do you believe they were ever imposed upon by
 “those votes and resolutions, made by what is
 “called acclamation, for their union, of which
 “corruption made one part, and fear forced the
 “remainder? Who, at this time, is unacquainted
 “with the spring and wires of their miserable
 “puppet-show? *Who does not know the primary*
 “*assemblies, composed of a president, of a secretary,*
 “*and a few assistants, whose day's work was paid*
 “*for?*” *

In his speech to the convention, on the first of February, 1793—he called his sovereign a *conspirator* whom the convention *had justly condemn-*
ed to die—and represented his punishment as a *signal act of justice.*—

In his Address to his Constituents,---he boasted of his opposition to “*that act of justice,*” which he there called an unhappy event, and one that

* As the same farce is now playing over again in Belgia, and the same means are pursuing for promoting a *voluntary* union of that country with France, Brissot's observations on the subject are particularly worthy of attention. They will be found between pages 72 and 84 of the excellent translation of his pamphlet, published by Stockdale.

was utterly *useless* as to adding the least strength to the republic. Brissot, therefore, was *a notorious promulgator of falsehoods**, and proved his own falsehood by his own inconsistency.

Lastly, *Brissot* projected a descent upon England, with an army of one hundred thousand men; and instigated the convention to declare war against this country. Brissot, therefore, was *an avowed enemy to England*, although his friendship has been the boast of an ENGLISH SENATOR.

These facts cannot be denied; these deductions cannot be controverted: it therefore follows that you publicly proclaimed yourself the friend of *a perjured traitor---a base calumniator---an enemy to every existing government and to social order---a notorious promulgator of falsehood---and an enemy to England!!!* If Cicero's definition of friendship be a just one---and, as he was a *republican* and a *philosopher*, your Lordship will of course be inclined to pay some respect to his opinion---the dread of Brissot's friends, evinced by some members of the upper house, will not prove to have been quite so preposterous as you---doubtless, from the most *disinterested* motives---wish to make it appear.—*Id, in quo est OMNIS VIS AMICITIÆ, voluntatum, studiorum, sententiarum summa consensio.*† Your constituents will, I trust, weigh this in their minds, and *act accordingly*.

Brissot

* Your Lordship, perhaps, is so much accustomed to political inconsistencies as to think them no flaw in the character of your friend. Certain it is, that by contrasting the debates on the commercial treaty with France, with the debates on the subject of the present war, you will find repeated instances of similar contradictions, in the declarations and professions of your leading associates.

† Cicero de Amicitia, Cap. 4. That the leading members of your "Party on Principle," which, after the experience of

Brissot was, in your apprehension, the focus whence emanated all the rays of political wisdom. Hence the esteem which you bestowed upon him was extended to his partisans whom you dignify with the appellation of "*the timid but enlightened Brissotin ministry*,"---Who planned and effected the ruin of the monarchy which they had sworn to obey, and the overthrow of the constitution which they had pledged themselves to support?---*The timid but enlightened Brissotin ministry*. Who projected the declaration of a general war, and devised the means of promoting a general insurrection? *The timid but enlightened Brissotin ministry*. Who proposed to convert the French into a *nation* of soldiers for the subjugation of Europe? * *The*

the last seven years, it would be no want of charity, and no deviation from truth, to describe, as a *Party without Principle*, agree with Cicero, on the necessity of a conformity of political sentiment between Public Characters, appears evident from the very extraordinary testimony delivered at Maidstone, on the trial of Mr. Arthur O'Connor. Mr. ERSKINE then declared, with all that emphasis which he is known invariably to give to his favourite pronoun, "*I never had any reason to think that Mr. O'Connor's principles and opinions differed from MY OWN.*" His Grace of NORFOLK said, "*I consider him as a gentleman acting warmly in the political line, and attached to Constitutional principles, in THE SAME WAY AS MYSELF.*"---THE EARL OF THANET avowed his conviction that "*he entertained THE SAME POLITICAL SENTIMENTS AS EVERY ONE OF THE OPPOSITION.*" And Mr. WHITBREAD declared "*his public principles appeared to be the SAME AS MY OWN.*" Would it, then, my Lord, be any violation of candour to infer, from your boasted intimacy with Brissot, a conformity of political sentiment; or to admit the supposition that, had you been summoned as an evidence on the trial of your friend, you would have delivered a similar testimony with regard to him to that which was delivered by your political associates at Maidstone with regard to the object of their most anxious solicitude?

* "*The whole of the French nation must form but one great army; all France must be an encampment.*"---Brissot's speech on the declaration of war against England and Holland.

timid

timid but enlightened Brissotin ministry. Who renounced all views of conquest and loudly proclaimed the independence of neighbouring states, and yet adopted measures for imposing on them laws, and for forcing them to sue for an union with France *? *The timid but enlightened Brissotin ministry.* Who rejected the *moderation* of Dumourier, preferred “the superior fitness of Miranda for the purposes of subversion and destruction,” and, finally, conceived the *glorious* projecting of SETTING FIRE TO THE FOUR CORNERS OF EUROPE? †---*The timid but enlightened Brissotin ministry.* It must be confessed, my Lord, that your ideas of *timidity* and *illumination* are somewhat singular: and I incline to believe, that, after your application of the latter term in this instance, your friend Mr. Fox will not feel himself much indebted to you for having complimented him with an “*enlightened* understanding.”

It would be foreign from the purpose of these strictures to enter into a laboured defence of the

* The general instructions to the national commissioners in the Netherlands, which I have before noticed, were signed by the executive council, (during the administration of the Brissotins) which consisted of Le Brun, Roland, Claviere, Monge, Garat and Pache—The three first were certainly the friends of Brissot—Pache he also acknowledges to have possessed his confidence and friendship, at that period. And his party had a decided majority in the Convention. Thus all the measures adopted, at this crisis, however some of them might afterwards be censured by Brissot, must be ascribed to the Brissotin ministry.

† In a private letter of Brissot's, quoted by Mallet du Pan, is the following passage—“*We must set fire to the four corners of Europe—in that alone is our safety. Dumourier cannot suit us. Miranda is the general for us; he understands the revolutionary power, he has courage, knowledge,*” &c.

war, even were I of opinion that such a defence was necessary. But thinking, as I do, that we are fighting for our very existence, as an independent state, and that the ambitious spirit of the French republic, evinced in its daring projects of aggrandizement, would alone have justified a declaration of war, on our part, I must deem it wholly superfluous to discuss the validity of the other grounds of complaint. Besides, after the unconfuted arguments which have been already urged on that subject, and the irresistible proofs that have been adduced, how could I expect to convince men who reason as if no such arguments and no such proofs had ever been brought forward---those who are open to conviction must already be convinced.

One mode of expression, however, used, by your Lordship, I cannot suffer to pass unnoticed:---You call the princes who first waged war against France, or to speak more properly, against whom France first declared war, the *conspirators of Pilnitz*---the *original crusaders* ;* the language to be sure, cannot be liable

* In the fervour of your zeal, on this occasion, indeed, I must confess, your Lordship had been greatly exceeded by a *most learned Doctor* of the established Church, who, three years before, had *most piously* called upon Heaven to defeat the schemes of ALL the powers, and, of course, those of Great Britain, which should presume to defend their territories, their subjects, their property, their constitution, and their religion, against the unprovoked attacks of the French revolutionists. But as it is impossible for any one to do justice either to the sentiments or the language of Dr. PARR, I shall suffer him to speak for himself.

“ If, indeed, the threatened crusade of RUFFIAN DESPOTS
 “ should be attempted, it will, in my opinion, be an outrageous in-
 “ fringement upon the laws of nations; it will be a SAVAGE
 “ CONSPIRACY against the written and the unwritten rights
 “ of mankind; and therefore, in the sincerity of my soul, I pray
 “ the

liable to objection, since it is borrowed from your *enlightened* friends on the continent, but the assertion

“ the righteous governor of the universe, the creator of men,
 “ and the King of Kings, I pray HIM to abate the pride, to
 “ assuage the malice, and to confound all the devices, of ALL
 “ the parties, directly or indirectly leagued in this complicated
 “ SCENE OF GUILT AND HORROR! this insult upon the dig-
 “ nity of human nature itself! This TREASON against the
 “ Majesty of God’s own image, rational and immortal man.”
A Sequel to a printed paper, &c. p. 73.

This is evidently written *con amore*;—nor *Barrere*, nor *Tallien*, nor your friend *Brissot*, nor yet the poetaster *Chenier* himself could have formed a better paragraph on the subject.—To imprecate disaster on the arms of Britain, (for a supplication to “ confound her devices” certainly extends to this), should her sovereign presume to engage in a war with France, contrary to the opinion of this omniscient Doctor, was, indeed, a stretch of revolutionary patriotism, which would have better become the Philanthropic Ambassador “ of human nature” *Anacharsis Cloots* than an English clergyman, who once, it is said, aspired to a seat on the Episcopal Bench, but who certainly enjoyed, by *anticipation*, the *Residentiaryship* of St. Paul’s. I refer the Doctor to the subsequent pages for proofs that the aggressive principles and disposition of the French had been openly displayed *long before* his pamphlet was composed. The Doctor shines more as a *Grecian* than as a prophet. After some eulogies on the French and their cause, he thus predicts: “ The people of England, I
 “ am sure, then, are too gallant to engage in a war against
 “ such a nation; in such circumstances. The Parliament of
 “ England is too enlightened to approve of a war. The King of
 “ England is far too wise, too humane, too magnanimous, to pro-
 “ pose a war.”

The reflections which arise in the mind on the perusal of such passages as these are too numerous to admit of compression into the small compass of a note. One observation only shall I allow myself. That an English clergyman should select a passage from a prayer appointed to be read in time of war, for the express purpose of imprecating the divine favour on the arms of his sovereign, and defeat on those of his enemies, and directly reverse its application, is, I conceive, a fact, without a precedent, as without an excuse. The stress laid upon the word ALL, which is printed in small capitals, would, of itself, suffice to demonstrate the writer’s intentions of including Great Britain in his general anathema. And he cannot but be sensible, that, if
 the

tion it involves I must absolutely reject as being unfounded in truth.---You will not, I conceive, pretend to support the authenticity of the *pretended* treaty of *Pavia*, evidently fabricated for the malicious purpose of rendering the powers at war with France odious in the eyes of her own subjects, and of the other European states. As to the confederacy of Pilnitz, which you have liberally termed a *conspiracy*, the explanation entered into with the French Ministry by the contracting parties to that treaty at the beginning of the year 1792, sufficiently proves its object to have been not only justifiable but laudable. The princes who signed it had no intention of reducing the power or dismembering the dominions of France.---They only wished to see the person and lawful authority of the King (then kept a close prisoner after his unfortunate effort to

the paragraph had been written some few months later (and the *intention* is indisputably the same) it would have involved him in something like the guilt of treason, not, indeed, "against the "majesty of God's own image, rational and immortal man" but against that sovereign to whom he owes *exclusive* allegiance, and against those laws to which he owes implicit obedience.

If, instead of rifling the stores of STOBÆUS, in order to overwhelm his adversary with a torrent of quotations,* the Doctor had turned over the pages of the *Mercur de France*, the *Journal de Sabatier*, and the addresses of MOUNIER and TOLENDAL to their constituents, he would have been much better qualified for the discussion of his subject, and, though he might not have excited the admiration of the Birmingham manufacturers at the depth of his erudition, he might, at least, have secured himself against reproach, for the shallowness of his judgment on French politics, for the display of his ignorance of "the laws of nations," and for his wanton calumny on the Continental powers?

* The disgusting exultation displayed by Dr. PARR, (in his dispute with Mr. CURTIS on the superiority of his classical knowledge, has always appeared to me as absurd, as if the Doctor's writing-master, at his own school at Norwich, had, in some altercation with him on a different subject, treated the Doctor with contempt, because he was not able to write so fair a hand as himself.

escape) freed from a situation which they considered (and to judge from the event, with great reason) "to be an object of common interest to all the sovereigns of Europe.*" For this purpose alone they declared themselves ready to employ their force and to act with decision. As soon, however, as the King was restored to a semblance of liberty, and had accepted the new constitution, they announced, that from a change of circumstances, the above declaration was not to be acted upon: furnishing thereby the most unequivocal proof, that their views were entirely pacific towards France; for otherwise the circumstances under which the king had acceded to the constitution, and the notorious absurdity of supposing his situation to have been that of freedom and independence, would have afforded them the fairest pretexts to indulge a disposition for hostility, if they had really entertained such a disposition. Their conduct, indeed, instead of being entitled to the charge of a conspiracy against France, was really censurable, as it partook too much of blind confidence in the professed amity of that country, and of supine forbearance in suffering the new systems it had adopted to establish themselves, to the great and obvious danger of every neighbouring state.

A perfect contrast to such conduct may be found in the measures of that Jacobin faction which, with Brissot and Condorcet at its head, sought for pretexts to engage their country in a war, knowing that they could not otherwise effect their purposes either in or out of France. Determined to compel the King to propose a declaration of war, Delessart,

* See the real declaration of Pilnitz, by the Emperor and the King of Prussia, dated May 27, 1791.

the minister for foreign affairs, was dismissed, as being a man of too much integrity and moderation, to lend his assistance to the accomplishment of so nefarious a plan:* Dumourier was appointed to succeed him, who immediately assumed a tone of authority perfectly calculated to produce the wished for crisis; but the replies of the imperial court, though firm, were extremely temperate; it opposed candour to misrepresentation; facts to falsehood. The determination, however, was previously made, and, impelled by the insidious solicitations of the *Brissotin* faction, the unhappy Louis proposed the declaration of war, which was immediately adopted by the convention.

Of the truth of this statement, I can produce the most irrefragable proof. M. Delessart, from his prison at Orleans, wrote a letter to his friend M. Neckar; in which he laments the delay which had taken place in procuring the papers necessary for his defence—"I shall lament"—says M. Delessart—"as long as I live, that it could not appear
 " at the present period; for it would prove curious
 " not on account of what particularly relates to
 " me, but in consequence of the manifestation of
 " what has passed in foreign courts, *in consequence*
 " *of the demonstration that they were unwilling to*
 " *make war against us*; in consequence of THE
 " UNANSWERABLE PROOF, that it is WE who
 " HAVE PROVOKED THEM TO HOSTILITIES, who
 " *began them, and who have set Europe against*
 " *us.*"---I must remark, that M. Delessart could

* The successor of M. Delessart, in his first letter to the French Ambassador at the court of Vienna—observes—"The disgrace of that Minister (Delessart) has been occasioned, in a great measure, by the feebleness with which he conducted his negotiations."

not be *mistaken*, he had himself conducted all the negotiations with the imperial court, till the appointment of Dumourier to the foreign department, and was, of course, fully acquainted with the dispositions and intentions of the confederated powers. His evidence, therefore, is decisive. As to the letter in question, M. Neckar thus speaks of it.---This letter is the more entitled to credit, “as it was written without any particular view, “and at a moment when the present situation of “the King” (*then a prisoner in the temple*) “could “not have been foreseen: this letter is from a “solitary prisoner to a man not living in France: “this letter, in short, was drawn up by a person “who is no more. What a testimony! *Did a “testimony ever exist upon which the character of “truth was more immoveable?* It seems to have “derived from misfortune and from death something at once terrible and “sacred.”*

If any other proof were requisite, for the establishment of this point, I could produce the authority of *Brissot* himself, and several of his associates, to prove that France was the aggressor, and that the powers against whom she waged war acted merely on the defensive. So early as the 20th of October, 1791, *BRISSET* urged the Legislative Assembly to declare war. “You must not only defend yourselves, “you must BEGIN THE ATTACK,” said he. He returned to the charge on the 29th of December, 1791, when he did not blush to assign the following reason for his earnestness.---“*In short, we must “have gold to pay the troops.---France must have “war to re-establish her finances and her credit.*”

* Reflections submitted to the French nation on the intended process against Louis XVI.—by M. Neckar.

In the same assembly, on the 4th of January, 1792, ISNARD exclaimed, "*Let all Frenchmen hasten to the Jacobin-Club; we are this moment about to declare war.*" In the summer of 1792, when employed in the execution of his plan for the deposition of his sovereign, BRISSOT said—*We made him declare war, in order to put him to the test.** At the same time COLLOT D'HERBOIS, the father of the Republic, openly declared, "*we were resolved to have war, because war would kill royalty.*"† In his factious paper, *Le Patriote François*, BRISSOT, after his plan had succeeded, spoke in still plainer terms, and openly avowed the motive of his conduct.—"BUT FOR THE WAR, THE REVOLUTION OF THE TENTH OF AUGUST WOULD NEVER HAVE TAKEN PLACE: BUT FOR THE WAR, FRANCE WOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN A REPUBLIC."‡—Your friend, Brissot, therefore, was the miscreant who, with the assistance of his *enlightened* associates, involved the belligerent powers in a war, merely for the accomplishment of his own diabolical schemes—this was a part of his *philosophic* plan for *setting fire to the four corners of Europe*.—May such philosophers ever meet the fate of Brissot!—His public conduct had been marked by a flagrant dereliction of all the principles of justice; in the pursuit of his ambitious designs the laws of his country were

* See *Le Tableau de Paris*, par Peltier.

† And yet Mr. Fox had the boldness to declare in a late debate (February 3, 1800) that "previous to August, 1792, *there was the utmost and the most decided neutrality on the part of France.*"—To what lengths will men suffer themselves to be carried by the spirit of party!

‡ Sans la Guerre, la Revolution du 10 août n'auroit eû lieu; sans la Guerre, la France ne seroit pas republique.—*Le Patriote François*; Samedi 22 Sep. 1792.

incessantly

incessantly violated:---and his death was the consequence of a conviction unauthorized by law, preceded by a trial in which all the forms and rules of justice were holden in derision. In short, the measure which he had meted to others was measured back to himself. Two such philosophers as La Fayette and Brissot, possessed of abilities to enforce their principles, would soon throw the whole world into confusion, with no other instrument of disorganization, than the *holy right of insurrection*.

You maintain that instead of asserting the right of interference, we were alone interested in checking the principle. It is precisely on that ground that we have been obliged to assert the right. On that subject, however, I have only one remark to make. The authority of Vattel you must allow to be decisive; particularly since it was quoted by Mr. Fox, in support of his own opinion on the question.---That opinion went to the establishment of the general principle, that one state has no right to interfere in the government of another state---a principle, the justice of which no man can deny, and which, of course, so eminent a writer, on the rights of nations, as Vattel, could not fail to confirm. But Mr. Fox, with a degree of insincerity, that might perhaps be excusable in an advocate pleading in a court of justice, but which certainly was unpardonable in the more liberal and dignified discussions of a British senate, omitted to notice Vattel's exception to the general rule, which immediately applied to the point in question.---“If
“ then,” says Vattel, “there be any where a
“ nation of a *restless* and *mischievous* disposition,
“ always ready to *injure others*, to traverse their de-
“ signs, and TO RAISE DOMESTIC TROUBLES;
it

“ it is not to be doubted, that all have a right to
 “ join, in order to repress, chastise, and put it ever
 “ after out of his power to injure them.”* A
 more complete justification of the conduct of
 England, and the other belligerent powers, could
 not have been offered. It is evident, that the right
 here asserted by Vattel, is founded on the natural
 principle of self-preservation.--Though unable to
 resist the cogency of those motives assigned by his
 Majesty’s Ministers, for repelling the unprovoked
 aggression of the French, you boldly declare that
 the motives which they proclaimed to the public
 and supported in parliament were not the *real*
 motives by which their conduct was influenced.—
 But were you not aware that by such a declaration,
 you exposed yourself and your friends to the danger
 of recrimination, and supplied your opponents with
 the most formidable weapons of offence? Were I
 disposed to follow your example, and avail myself
 of this mode of argument, I might reason thus---
 Let the people of England place no confidence in
 the declarations and professions of the leaders of
 opposition;---no regard to “ the public, but an at-
 “ tention to private and particular interests, has led
 “ them on from step to step to the present scene
 “ of accumulated depravity, in which the most sa-
 “ cred duties of patriotism, are sacrificed to the
 “ sordid spirit of party.” Listen to the juvenile
 statesman who has lately taken the command of their
 slender band in the upper house. He will tell you
 that the motive and end of his public conduct are
 the love of his country, and the welfare of the
 state. But these are only lures for the multitude;
 the true rule and real object of his political pro-

* Vattel, book ii. chap. 4.

ceedings are of a very different nature.—Together with the immense fortune, he inherited the parsimonious spirit of his grandfather:—the latter has invariably served as a guardian to the former.—On the turf and at the gaming table, where other fashionable youths have accelerated their ruin; that spirit uniformly presides, and, attended by wily prudence and wary circumspection, gratifies the mind it inhabits by the accumulation of gain. In the field of politics its influence equally predominates. In times of difficulty and danger when the country is threatened by a powerful foe; a man who holds the highest rank in the power of the crown to bestow, and who is, moreover, the richest subject in the kingdom, might naturally be expected to contribute, in proportion to his abilities, to the defence of the state—(either by an augmentation of its land forces, or by an addition to its naval armaments.) The only mode of avoiding this contribution,—without forfeiting every claim to decency ---is by feigning a difference of political sentiment which precludes the possibility of supporting administration, and of course affords a sanction for refusing to contribute to the support of a war, which he loudly condemns---I have furnished the clue, let others pursue it— *verbum sat sapienti.*

If we attend to the hoary Duke, who, quitting the recesses of his favourite forest, has resumed his station in the ranks of opposition, we shall hear the same disinterested professions, the same patriotic principles. But the whole tenour of his conduct, since his first entrance into public life, warns us to be cautious, in bestowing confidence where consistency has never appeared, and where patriotism

has

has been frequently sacrificed at the shrine of ambition.

Still less credit is due to the patriotic declarations of that political Cameleon, whose measures have been subject to perpetual variation ; whose

Honour

Is nothing but mutation, aye, and that
From one bad thing to worse.

Shakespeare.

who affords an illustrious example of age, without the benefits of experience ; and whose extreme ambiguity of conduct has at once deprived him of the personal advantages of party, and left him without the merit of independence. He has already, if he be not belied, experienced the beneficial effects of *peace-making* ; and, it is supposed, he wishes for an opportunity of again displaying his talents in that line.

Were I to pursue this mode of reasoning, and it might easily be extended to the leaders of the party in the lower-house, you would, doubtless, charge me with being uncandid and illiberal ; and would probably question my right to ascribe to any man motives which he publicly disavowed. You have, however, thought proper to subject yourself to this imputation ; and, having adopted a favourite system, are resolved, like a true system-monger, to make every thing bend to it.

Before I advert to the motives which *you* have assigned to ministers, in lieu of those by which they professed to be influenced, and which were sufficiently powerful to satisfy a vast majority of the nation, as to their justice and strength, for you are compelled to acknowledge “ that the war was “ entered into with the approbation of the public,”
though

disorganizing pretensions, or even to submit these pretensions to the issue of a negotiation: vain and idle as must be all negotiation with such men. On such a basis stands your assertion, that the expulsion of the French from the territories of our allies was the fair and legitimate end of the war.

But it is a waste of time to bestow serious notice on an argument so ridiculous as to sanction the supposition, that it is the offspring of imbecillity. The motive for bringing it forward, however, is too obvious to escape observation. By representing the operations which succeeded the expulsion of the French from Holland and the Netherlands, as the commencement of a new war, you evidently intended to fix the charge of aggression on the allies, who, after the enemy had been compelled to retire within the limits of his own territory, certainly acted offensively. But the attempt is as gross as the artifice is shallow. The smallest portion of common sense is sufficient to secure the mind against the effects of an imposition, which it is only necessary to expose in order to defeat.

Having denied that the minister could have been actuated by the ostensible reasons which he held out to the parliament and the public, because forsooth, he must have "*anticipated the chance of calamity*," you proceed, with your usual confidence, to state his real motive, and gravely inform us, that Mr. Pitt consented to involve the nation in a war, merely with a view to promote the dissolution of the whig-party! It was a sacrifice, you say, which he made to the Duke of Portland, and his friends! Your determination to support the system you have built for yourself, betrays you into perpetual contradictions, which all your ingenuity will be insufficient to reconcile. Let me ask you
how

how the whig-party could appear so formidable to Mr. Pitt, as to induce him to relinquish that measure which constituted the leading feature of his administration, and formed the grand object of his ambition, the speedy reduction of the national debt, which a war must inevitably augment; when you acknowledge that “he required not the addition of
 “their numbers; his triumphant and confiding
 “majority still remained; he was still surrounded
 “by the protecting influence of those who had supported him since he was at the helm of affairs;
 “*he had in his hands the full means of carrying his*
 “*measures into effect*; and without consultation, he
 “was already secure of the voice of those who had
 “listened to him with approbation, on the notice
 “given of a motion for reform?” Can you suppose, my lord, that there are men so prone to credulity, so lost to reason, or so blinded by prejudice, as to believe that the minister, whose talents have repeatedly extorted the tribute of admiration, even from his bitterest enemies, could act so much like a driveller, an idiot, as to sacrifice all his favourite pursuits, and risk the loss of that object, on which the power, and, in a great degree, the fame of every minister essentially depends,---the welfare and prosperity of his country*, merely for the acquisition of partisans, of which you admit, he stood not in need? Have you the vanity to imagine, that the high character of WILLIAM PITT,---the well-earned meed of genuine patriotism,---the rich fruit of twelve years labour in the field of politics,---can be blasted in a moment, by the impotent breath

* I here argue on *your own supposition*, (false as it undoubtedly is) that the observance of neutrality, on our part, would not have exposed the country to any kind of risk, but would, on the contrary, have secured it against all kind of danger.

of such an assailant? 'Tis the effort of the mole to destroy the nest of the eagle!

In your extreme eagerness to ruin the reputation of the minister, you ascribe to him the possession of qualities, incompatible with each other; you represent him as obstinate and pliant; determined and timid; fixed and changeable. In one part of your work, alluding to the Russian armament, you observe that the hasty relinquishment of their measures was as disgraceful to the ministers, as it was *fortunate for their country**. But in another part you say, speaking of the same event, "that to preserve his place, the minister *made light of the honour of his country*†. Unless you mean to affirm, that the loss of honour may, in some instances, be a fortunate occurrence, you evidently contradict yourself. At all events, it ill becomes those whose endeavours were successfully exerted, in preventing the interposition of this country, from restraining the efforts of Russia to extend her empire by the means of conquest, to censure ministers for *not* interfering in the affairs of Poland.‡ But the real *crime* of the minister, in your Lordship's eyes, was the adoption of those wise and vigorous measures, at the most important crisis that Europe ever witnessed, which induced many members of both houses, who had generally opposed his measures, to join administration, and, by that means, deprived your party of all that could give it either weight or respectability.---*Hinc iræ, hinc lachrymæ.*

I shall not attempt to follow you through your

* P. 171.

† P. 292.

‡ See the address proposed on the 21st of February, 1793, by Mr. Grey, a gentleman whose *consistency* and *moderation* are alike eminent and conspicuous.

long dissertation upon party. The few remarks I shall make on it will be made with deference, since I know that it is a subject on which a difference of opinion subsists between men of the soundest constitutional knowledge, and of the purest principles. To *you*, the necessity of a party on *principle*, as you call it, and the benefits to be derived from its existence, are so obvious, that a man must be blind not to perceive them. To *me*, I confess, there appears no such necessity; both history and observation convince me, that many and serious evils result from party spirit, which, particularly in times of public difficulty and danger, destroys that unanimity which it is the duty of the patriot to enforce, and restrains that active vigour of exertion, which such a crisis so peculiarly demands; and I know of no advantage that can accrue from it, which might not be produced by means, more consistent with the honour of individuals, and more conformable to the spirit of the constitution. Let every member of the senate discharge his duty conscientiously, by preserving that independence of mind which prevents the support or rejection of a public measure, from being influenced by the principles or connections of the person by whom it is proposed; and the rights of the crown, and the liberty of the subject will, without the assistance of a party, be effectually secured from invasion. The very principles and form of our constitution, in their present state of maturity, suffice to prevent an undue preponderance in any of its component parts; it bears within itself the means of self-preservation, it requires no foreign aid.--- But if the existence of a party be, as you state, essential to the existence of the constitution, it follows, of course, that it is the duty of every man
to

to become a member of it. In that case, it must bear within it a principle of self-destruction: the period of its perfection must be the period of its dissolution. For when it shall have consolidated into one body all descriptions of men, it will no longer have any object of pursuit, it must cease to exist, for the very term, party, implies the existence of a body to which it acts in opposition.

In your observations on this subject you make a distinction, hostile both to the spirit and principle of the constitution, between "the friends of monarchy" and "the advocates of freedom," which must inevitably lead to this conclusion, that the friends of monarchy are enemies to freedom, and the advocates of freedom enemies to monarchy. As you class yourself and your party in this last description of subjects, I shall leave you the benefit of the distinction without attempting to analyze the principle.

The learned author of the justly celebrated treatise on the spirit of laws gives a much better definition than your Lordship, of the origin of party under a free government. He viewed the subject with an impartial eye; and, independently of the claims derived from a superiority of knowledge, is certainly, from being totally disinterested, better entitled to credit, than a man who asserts the privilege of being the judge in his own case; "As in
 "such a state, there would be two visible powers,
 "the legislative and the executive, and every citizen would have a will of his own, and would
 "support his independence in any manner he pleased, the majority of the people would be more
 "attached to one of these powers than the other,
 "*the greater number, not possessing, in general, a*
sufficient portion of equity or good sense, to hold them
both

"*both in equal estimation**" Your Lordship may, I think, without injustice, be placed among the *greater number*.

But whatever difference of opinion may subsist, with regard to the origin of party, no man can be justified in withholding his belief from your statement of its object. Though, on some points, you have carefully preserved the convenient ambiguity of the ancient oracles, on this, it must be acknowledged, you have been sufficiently explicit. "*Their object has, at all times, undoubtedly been to acquire power.*" Any comment on such an avowal would only weaken its effect, which I by no means incline to do. I cannot, however, refrain from remarking, that the more sagacious and experienced leaders of the party will scarcely be disposed to bestow that commendation on your candour, which it certainly deserves; at least, if we may be allowed to judge from the conduct of Mr. Fox, in a late debate, who indignantly disclaimed the very object which you here assign to him †.--- But I must, at the same time, observe, that the credit which you gain by your candour, you lose by your inconsistency, in censuring Mr. Pitt, for

* De l'Esprit des Loix. Liv. 19. chap. 27.

† Lord Guildford has, in the debate on the Habeas Corpus suspension bill, declared he despised the idea of opposition to government, upon such *base principles*, as the *desire of place*, factional motives, or views of *personal ambition*: and he defied any man, with the smallest colour of justice, to accuse the opposition of the first charge, (the desire of place) because it could not be done with fairness or with truth.—What were your Lordship's feelings, when you heard this declaration, so contradictory to your own? Whatever your *feelings* might be on the occasion, you took care to accommodate your *professions* to the impression which your party wished to make on the house, and boldly declared that you was not actuated "by prospects of place or power."—*Woodfall's Parliamentary Reports*, vol. i. p. 524.

a wish to preserve *that* which all your own efforts are exerted to obtain.

You have, in exposing the *manœuvres* of your party, sacrificed your prudence to the gratification of a puerile vanity. Those manœuvres can only tend to the creation of disgust, by convincing us that, at least, as much art is employed in the *management* of an opposition, as is ascribed, falsely I hope and believe, by you to the agents of ministry, in the arrangement of a parliament. When we find that a body of men, professing to be actuated by the same sentiments, are reduced to the necessity of meeting, previously to the discussion of any important question in parliament, to communicate to each other, "the line of debate," which they mean to pursue, in order to avert the danger of contradiction, we can easily descry a predetermination not to be convinced by any arguments that may be adduced in support of the measure they are *associated* to oppose; but we are at a loss to discover any steadiness of principle, or unity of opinion.

You seem to take infinite delight in displaying your knowledge of the various arrangements of the minister, with those whom you stile his *new friends*; you ring the changes on the different portions and degrees of honour, emolument, or power, assigned, or intended to be assigned to each, with a degree of self-satisfaction evidently resulting from a consciousness of superior *intelligence*.--- Amusements like these appear to be suited to your capacity; and as they are much more inoffensive than some other species of diversion in which you are apt to indulge, you may be allowed to enjoy them as much as you please.

But the accuracy of your intelligence may justly
be

be doubted, when, even on material points, on which it is difficult to conceive how a *mistake* should arise, you are guilty of the most gross misrepresentations. A flagrant instance of this kind occurs, in your attempts to induce a belief that two noblemen, now high in office, had been not merely passive well-wishers to, but actively instrumental in promoting, the measure of a parliamentary reform. And, to preclude the possibility of a doubt, as to the species of reform to which you alluded, you expressly said in the house, that nothing had been proved against the persons tried for high treason, but what could be legally proved against these noble Lords, and others who acted with them. This false assertion, however, was speedily repelled, and you had the mortification to experience as positive and unqualified a contradiction, as was ever received by any man in a public assembly.

The Duke of Portland declared, that so far from having been a *supporter* of parliamentary reform, he had always *resisted and reprobated* that doctrine whenever it had been brought forward. Earl Spencer was equally explicit: he candidly admitted, that in his youth he had been led to attend some popular meetings, but the disgust he experienced at the variety of absurd and extravagant plans, contended for by the different members, had soon induced him to withdraw himself from *all* such meetings. His Lordship drew with accuracy the line of distinction between the question of a reform in parliament in 1780, and the question of a reform in 1792, 1793, 1794, and 1795: he justly stated them to be distinct questions, different in object, and *exceedingly different, indeed*, in the proposed means of attaining that object.—

The object of the parliamentary reformists, in the year 1780, was the reform of certain abuses then existing in the house of commons, and which were pointed out at the time. Some of them had since been removed; but could their objects, he asked, be compared with the objects of those who affected to stand for parliamentary reform in these times? Did they wish *to overturn the constitution, new model the government, and make laws for themselves*, separate and distinct from the laws enacted by the three branches of the legislature? "No man," said his Lordship, "will dare impute to them any such dangerous and unconstitutional designs. It is, therefore, extremely unfair, and, *in the highest degree, unjust*, to impute to those who attended the popular meetings in 1780, and might wish for the reform of a few existing abuses at that time, the wild, extravagant, and visionary theories avowed by modern reformers." After such an instance of misrepresentation as this, how can you, my Lord, expect that the public will give credit to any of your assertions, that are unsupported by proof?

Not content with misrepresentations, you have recourse to abuse, and calumniate, with all the petulant invective of disappointed ambition, the very men whose countenance and support have constituted the principal, if not the sole, honour of your political life. Enraged at the diminution of strength, which, from the secession of its most respectable members, your party has experienced, you represent the seceders as having sacrificed their principles to their folly; as being destitute of public virtue; as being perfectly inefficient in themselves; as mere *nominal heads* of the party, who were solely indebted for the consequence they enjoyed with
the

the public, to the talents and abilities of those around them. You go still farther, and insinuate, that the acceptance of the garter by the Duke of Portland was an event that was attended with the loss of his character.

I should deem it an insult to those truly respectable persons who are thus grossly reviled, to enter into a formal justification of their conduct, in a reply to *such* imputations: that conduct requires no defence; those imputations can only generate contempt. While they remained in opposition, even those who differed from them, most essentially, on various topics of political discussion, never presumed to question the purity of their motives, or to cast the slightest suspicion on the integrity of their conduct. They never sought to depreciate their talents, nor to detract from that consequence which naturally attached to their rank, to their fortune, and still more than either, to their *character*. For however the subtle ingenuity of political sophists may be exerted to limit the sphere of its influence, excellence of private character will, I trust, ever continue to retain its due weight in political, as well as in social, life. Whoever lessens the influence of morality, saps the firmest basis of a state. Merited reprobation is incurred by systems of policy, which are repugnant to morality: should not then, the same principle excite the same sentiment, with respect to politicians who set her laws at defiance?*

The conduct of the seceders from your party has been fair, upright, and honourable: and though it

* "I will never," says Bacon, "set *politics* against *ethicks*; especially for that true *ethicks* are but as a handmaid to divinity and religion."

may be exposed to the misinterpretations of the prejudiced, and to the misconceptions of splotic partisans, it can never be subject to the misconceptions of those who know that the mind in which *true* patriotism and independence reside, will neither court the power which degrades, nor reject the responsibility which *honours* ; will neither suffer motives of ambition to smother its love of the country, nor the shackles of party to restrain its efforts to promote her welfare.

It has been the custom of your party, and of those who profess to approve its measures, to represent its opponents, as men destitute of all honour and principle, for no other reason than because they are its opponents. Though the whole tenour of a man's life has been marked by the most rigid integrity, and by a display of every social virtue, the moment he accepts a place in administration, he is supposed to have undergone a complete mental metamorphosis, to have forfeited all pretension to the commendations which before it was universally acknowledged he had deserved ; and, in short, to have experienced a total change in his nature. Preposterous as this may appear, it has become the daily practice of opposition, and of those prints which are devoted to their cause. It is a species of calumny, however, which merits the severest reprobation ; since it tends to impress the minds of the vulgar and uninformed, with the idea that offices, although instituted for the benefit of the community, are useless incumbrances ; and that those who fill them, however ably and honourably, instead of rendering essential service to their country, are so many monsters that prey upon her vitals.

Your reflection on the duke of Portland, is alike indecent and illiberal. To prove that it was founded
in

in justice, it would have been necessary to show that his grace was unworthy of the honour that had been conferred on him. The consciousness of your inability to do this, induced you to content yourself with a declaration, which will not easily obtain credit, that his sovereign and the nation destined the blue ribband for Lord Howe. Whence you derived this information your readers are left to divine. That the friend of Brissot cannot be the confident of an English monarch is too obvious to escape any man's observation: and as to the *nation*, its opinion is as well known to any individual as to your Lordship, unless, indeed, you have adopted the French signification of the word, in which sense, it means the voice of the rabble, or of a score or two of the most profligate and factious individuals, which the metropolis can supply. Here, thank Heaven, we acknowledge no such nation.—The sovereign is the true fountain of honour. What he gives, we must believe he freely gives, unless the unworthiness of the object be construed into a proof of restraint. In this instance, however, no such proof existed. If dignified rank; patriotism untainted, and honour unimpeached, can afford a just claim to distinction, this claim was possessed by the Duke of Portland. And, without detracting in the least from the meritorious services of Lord Howe, I may safely affirm, that the ribband could not have decorated a more worthy man.

The appellation of *nominal leaders*, when I consider to what persons it is applied, is too ridiculous to deserve a comment. Is there now a man of your party who possesses the requisite qualifications for a leader of opposition? I except Mr. Fox, who is certainly endowed with splendid talents, and fills with so much ability the station which he at present occupies,

occupies, that I am almost disposed to wish he may retain it for the rest of his life.

In the lower house, the party exhibits some abilities, much malevolence, and *no* consequence. I will not stop to enquire whether it contains, among its most strenuous supporters, any man who unites talents that fascinate with principles that disgust; any man of such acknowledged profligacy, both in public and private life, as to sanction the supposition, that even those who act with him would think his company *in council* a disgrace to their characters; any man who is in the constant habit of violating the laws which he has contributed to form, and which it is his duty to enforce; or who converts an honourable privilege into a means of subsistence, or of personal security. —Such an enquiry would be foreign from my purpose.

In the upper house every debate exemplifies the inefficiency of the party. The duke of Bedford's patriotic virtues are still in the bud, and the marquis of Landsdowne's are going fast to decay. Your Lordship possesses zeal indeed,—but it has been the fate of bigotry, in all ages, both religious and political, to injure the very cause it has been most anxious to support. Besides zeal, *alone*, though it may render a man useful as a subordinate agent, can never qualify him for a leader of a party.

One of the most pitiful subterfuges to which your party have recourse, for the purpose of acquiring popularity, at the expence of their opponents, is the perversion of particular expressions, and the misrepresentation of particular facts. Several notable instances of this kind occur in that publication which is the object of these strictures.—

“Perish our commerce, let our constitution survive!”

“vive!”—is an expression which had been long falsely ascribed to Mr. Wyndham, and, by the unwarrantable interpretation artfully given to it, an insidious attempt was made to render it prejudicial to that gentleman’s interest. Your Lordship condescended to give sanction to the popular prejudice, as well with regard to its author, (for leaving the words unappropriated you certainly encourage the prevailing idea—whether intentionally or not can only be known to yourself—that they were spoken by Mr. Wyndham,) as to its import, until a recent explanation in the house of commons, served at once to undeceive the credulous who had believed, and to expose the profligate, who had circulated, the injurious report.—The expression, *you* say, “involves a paradox that it would be treating the understandings of your constituents with contempt to investigate.” To *me*, the expression, far from appearing paradoxical, ever seemed perfectly intelligible, and declaratory of a sentiment which no true Briton would disown.—If ever the time should arrive when we should be reduced to the dreadful alternative of either giving up our commerce or our constitution, perish the man who would hesitate in his choice of the two evils, and who would not instantly join in the patriotic exclamation of—“perish our commerce, let our constitution survive *.”

The

* It would be no difficult matter to prove, that you have adopted the very sentiment which you here seem to reprobate, and, by that means, to make you, at least in this instance, *patriotic* in spite of yourself. In expatiating upon the evil consequences of the war, you admit the injury which commerce sustains to be one of its most serious calamities: and as you confess that you see no prospect of an end to the war, the destruction of our commerce must appear to you to be inevitable.—In exaggerating the
beneficial

The next expression you have selected---and the selection, I confess, is a proof of your *judgment*---is one that has been still more perverted and misrepresented, if possible, for the most mischievous purposes, than that which I have already noticed : I mean—*The swinish multitude* ; but you have even improved upon the original, and by an ingenious addition, which, having never before seen it, I imagine to be your own, have extended the obloquy from the people to their representatives—*the representatives of the Swinish multitude*.

It is scarcely possible that you could be ignorant of the true import of an expression, which some unprincipled miscreants had studiously perverted, for the base purpose of inflaming the minds of the lower class of people, by impressing them with an idea that their superiors treated them with unfeeling contempt. I will not, for a moment, admit the supposition, that any member of the senate could be so devoid of virtue, so destitute of honour, so completely abandoned, as to favour the accomplishment of a scheme so truly diabolical.—But if, contrary to all reasonable expectation, such a man were to be found, and, unhappily, so great is the degeneracy of the age, that crimes, however enormous, almost cease to excite astonish-

beneficial effects of *party*, you say—" the ultimate consequences " of the calamities of war cannot prove more seriously deplorable than the breaking up of the whig party."—Now this declaration could only be sanctioned by the assertion you had before made, that the party " had a tendency to preserve the constitution." It is, therefore, evident, that you consider the preservation of our constitution as an object of greater magnitude than the preservation of our commerce ;—and nothing more was meant, or could be reasonably understood, by the expression to which, for purposes best known to yourself, you have thought proper to assign so different a meaning.

ment,

ment, the whole compass of our language would be inadequate to supply terms of reprobation sufficiently strong to mark the abhorrence in which he must be holden by every virtuous, every honest mind.

You must certainly have known that this expression was employed, by the greatest orator, and, let me add, the soundest philosopher of the age, in allusion to an ancient adage familiar to every man. The object of the observation whence the expression was “artfully and maliciously extracted,” was to shew, that though the beneficial effects of our excellent constitution were equally experienced by all, yet to display, before the lower orders of society, all the minute and multiplied causes which tend to produce those effects; all the various divisions, connections, and dependencies, which, by forming a just adaptation of parts to the whole, essentially conduce to the beauty and stability of the glorious fabric, would be “*to throw pearls before swine.*” In this sense alone was the epithet *swinish* applied to the *multitude*. Is there any capacity so shallow as not to perceive the justice of the remark; or any mind so perverse as to deem it insulting to the people?

Give a peasant a watch of a curious construction—he will soon perceive its excellence, in the accuracy of its motions, and its just indication of time, and will *thence* be induced to acknowledge its value.—But explain to him the causes which produce these effects; call his attention to the mechanical principles upon which it is formed—point out the nice disposition of the various parts—the judicious arrangement of the different movements;—his surprise may be excited, but his knowledge will not be increased:—he will say to himself—“what is this to me? All I know, or regard is

P

“ this

“ this—the watch goes well, and answers my purpose.” The peasant would be in the right—but surely he could not deem it an insult to be told, that any exposition of the superior skill, displayed by the ingenious mechanic in that production, the excellence of which he acknowledged, would be thrown away upon him; and that to enter into such exposition, which he could not understand, would, in fact, be “ to throw pearls before swine*.” To give

* At the time when I gave this explanation of an expression which has supplied the wittlings of the party with such a constant theme for declamation, from the moment of its utterance to the present day, I did not think it necessary to refer to the Parliamentary Reports, in order to ascertain its accuracy; not being willing to admit the supposition that the leaders of the opposition in the House of Commons (whatever their daily scribblers might do) would be guilty of such barefaced effrontery, such a gross violation of truth, such a shameful departure from all honourable conduct, as to give not only a false interpretation of an expression so frequently employed to decorate their public and their private harangues, their senatorial and their convivial speeches, but even a false application of it. I did not then think that the profligacy of party could be carried to such an extreme, in *this* country, as to impel its votaries to have recourse to a palpable falsehood, for the base purpose of inflaming the minds of the populace, and directing their infuriate rage against an illustrious character, who had early and manfully stepped forward to stem that impetuous torrent which, in its destructive progress, has nearly reduced the fair fabric of civil society, to one shapeless mass of cumbrous ruins.—I, therefore, took it for granted that Mr. Burke had really applied the expression of the Swinish multitude to the people, generally;—and, knowing, that, during the whole course of his political life, the most inveterate of his enemies could not adduce a single instance, in which he had not displayed the most anxious regard for the liberties, welfare, and happiness of the people, I very naturally supposed that he had used the expression in the sense which I had here affixed to it. Great, then, was my surprize on receiving a letter from Mr. Burke, many months after the appearance of this pamphlet, in which he informed me that he had never meant to apply the expression to the people of this country, but had used it only in reference to the French literati, who had forsaken their patrons in order to court the multitude, and to partake of their crimes, and who, he predicted, with that prophetic spirit which so strongly

give currency to misrepresentations of such a dangerous tendency, is highly disgraceful to a man of your Lordship's rank—and that you intended to give the worst interpretation to the expression is evident from the charge of impiety, which you prefer against the person who uttered it.

But it is extremely curious to observe with a scrutinizing eye, the conduct of those who display such extreme sensibility with regard to every think that seems to affect the character of the people, or that can even, by the ingenuity of malice, be construed into a reflection upon them. Dr. Price, one of the most violent champions of the people, who wished to confer on them rights which it is happy for them they do not possess, modestly called the electors of Great Britain, *the dregs of the people*; * and your Lordship, in the same spirit, observes, “the habit of corruption has more deeply

P 2

and

strongly marked all his productions respecting the French revolution, would be ultimately trampled under the “*hoofs of a swinish multitude*”—a Parisian populace.

The reader will find a copy of this Letter at the end of the book; —the *original* (together with another interesting Letter, which I had the honour of receiving from Mr. BURKE, not long before his death) is in possession of his learned and respectable friend Dr. LAURENCE.—After *such* an explanation, the expression in question will, of course, be used only by those *to* whom it will be strictly applicable.

To such as may feel disposed to censure me for not omitting that part of the letter which is complimentary to myself, I shall candidly confess, that I take a pride, (an *honest* pride, I hope) in opposing the praise of Mr. BURKE to the calumnies of the Jacobins, even at the risk of increasing the inveteracy of that enmity to me, which, on all occasions, they have done me the honour to profess and display.

* “Discourse of the love of our country,” P. 39,—a comparison of this discourse with one preached by the Doctor, on the 29th of November, 1769, must excite the most lively regret for the apostacy

“ and universally pervaded the *community*, than
 “ it ever did any people of whose manners and
 “ customs we have a distinct account ;”—and, in
 another place you mention, “ *the degenerate and*
 “ *habitually corrupt minds of the people.*”—These,
 my Lord, are expressions of *contempt*, that scarcely
 admit of perversion or misrepresentation; they are
 so plain, that they cannot be mistaken.

On the subject of Parliamentary corruption you
 observe, that the man who has acquired the favour
 of others by purchase—in other words---who has
 obtained his seat by the influence of money---“ can
 “ consider it alone as useful in so far as he may make
 “ it conduce to the filling up that blank, created
 “ by the price he has paid, in his capital; or per-
 “ haps *of* increasing his stock in trade, and by
 “ that means of enabling him to return with ad-
 “ ditional recommendation to a future canvas---
 “ and thus with the same indifference for the mea-
 “ sures he supports, *that* his constituents *had* for
 “ the person they elected---the corruption of the
 “ representative soon becomes as open and avowed
 “ as that of his constituents.”

Your Lordship's political connections have no
 doubt supplied you with the basis of this observa-
 tion. But, as I pretend not to be so conversant
 with these matters as you seem to be, will you for-
 give me if I put a question, which, though cer-
 tainly very foreign from the subject, will, if I be
 favoured with an answer, tend to remove some

apostacy of this divine; who having been a most strenuous ad-
 vocate for the civil and religious liberty, for the political hap-
 piness and constitutional perfection of Great Britain, became as
 strenuous a partisan of the modern doctrines of liberty and
 equality, of the Rights of Man, and of the French Revolu-
 tion!

doubts

doubts from my mind, that are, no matter how, *there* connected with the principles you have advanced. By what means did *Mr. Sheridan* obtain *his* seat?---As I never recollect to have heard of any paternal estate which he possesses in the country; nor of any connection with persons of consequence in the vicinity of Stafford, nor even of his having ever resided within a hundred miles of the town which he represents, I have always been at a loss to conceive *how* he “acquired the favour” of the the inhabitants.---Your Lordship, perhaps, can give me some information on this head! for as you are politically connected with Mr. Sheridan, and doubtless admire his abilities as much as I do, I should not be greatly surprised, if you had availed yourself of his assistance in the composition of that picture of corruption which you have so ably drawn.*

But to return, from the kind of digression into which your dissertation upon party, and other observations which you have connected therewith, have betrayed me, I must remark, that your anxiety to render the ministers of this country odious to the people, has led you into as many errors and misrepresentations as your exaggeration of the defects of the ancient monarchy of France.

To your observations on the progress of seditious principles, the numerous *Jacobinical* clubs esta-

* I must not be supposed to admit the justice of the remark, that members, who obtain their seats by the means which your Lordship designates, are more corrupt or less independent than others; experience teaches me that your theory is contradicted by daily practice; and did I think it expedient to enter into the discussion of the subject, I doubt not but that I could easily demonstrate, that *independence* flows from the very source whence you make *corruption* proceed.

blished

blished in all the principal towns in the kingdom, and the numerous other proofs of an increasing spirit of disaffection, will supply the best answer. That the success of those who labour to diffuse such a spirit, may not have been equal to their industry I am willing to acknowledge; but that it has been sufficiently extensive to excite the most serious apprehensions in every true friend to the country, is unfortunately but too obvious. You expressly acknowledge the wisdom of Lord Bacon's statement, that *discontent* is one of the two grounds of *sedition*:---On this point, my Lord, we agree. It is a necessary consequence of the position, that whoever stands convicted of an attempt to excite discontent, is proved guilty of an effort to promote sedition. This being the case, let me ask, whether the extraordinary exertions of the constitutional and other societies, to circulate Paine's books and other publications of a similar tendency, were not intended to excite discontent? * Whether the conduct of the society of Friends to the People, in propagating an idea that Parliament was so constituted, as to be wholly inadequate to the purposes for which it was established, was not calculated to excite discontent? Whether the numerous addresses from disaffected societies in this country to the convention of France, subsequent to the deposition of the King, replete with reflections on the constitution of England, were not meant to excite discontent? † Whether the speeches of your party

* In one of these publications, it was openly declared "*that all government was tyranny, that all kings were tyrants, and their subjects slaves.*"

† It is by no means my intention to limit the object of those *patriotic* addresses to the suscitation of discontent. I am well aware

party in either house, upon the different public questions, which have been discussed since the war, have had any other object than to excite discontent? And, lastly, whether your own publication, in which you represent the war as a hopeless enterprise, originating in folly, conducted with ignorance and neglect, and productive of nothing but shame, disgrace, and ruin; in which you exaggerate our loss, and depreciate our conquests; in which you represent our ministers as unworthy of confidence, and wholly incompetent to the management of public affairs, in which you state "those around the King" to be undeserving of "the regard of the people;" and in which you magnify the resources of our enemies, and diminish our own; whether, I say, such a publication has not so evident a tendency to excite discontent, as to render it impossible to refer its appearance to any other motive?*

Let your constituents and the public answer these questions, and draw the natural inference.

aware, that the addresses had something of much greater importance in view, and that they perfectly understood the scale of disaffection.—From discontent to sedition; from sedition to insurrection; from insurrection to rebellion; from rebellion to deposition; from deposition to murder; from murder to republicanism. Such is the patriotic ladder by which the real friends to liberty ascend to the summit of political perfection!

* Your Lordship's visit, in company with two other minor leaders of opposition, to the *convicted felons* at Portsmouth, men who had been convicted of seditious practices against the state, cannot, when connected with other relative circumstances, fail to excite the reprobation of all who have a just sense of the dignity and decorum that ought invariably to be preserved by all public characters. Its obvious tendency, whatever might be the intention, was to encourage a spirit of discontent with the laws, and of disaffection to the government, of the country.

In

In describing the stratagems of the minister, which existed but in your own distempered imagination, to obtain that security which you had before declared he already enjoyed, you accuse him of having adopted "the hatred forms of French Anarchy;---" Clubs accordingly"----you say,---"every where appeared, *headed by the dependents, and established under the influence of "Government."* Your shameful inattention to facts exposes you to perpetual contradiction. The Loyal Associations were *not* established under the influence of government, nor did they bear the most distant resemblance to the hated forms of French Anarchy. I am as well acquainted with the origin of those associations, as I am with their principles and conduct, and I must observe, that your misrepresentations of the one are as gross as your ignorance of the other. The *motives* which influenced their establishment were a desire to expose the nefarious proceedings of the numerous seditious societies, which *had* "adopted the "hated forms of French anarchy," and to check the diffusion of French principles, which those societies had taken extraordinary pains to extend. Their *object* was the support of the *laws*---the preservation of the *constitution*---and the defence of persons and property against innovators and depredators. *Government had no concern whatever, either directly or indirectly, with the establishment or conduct of the ASSOCIATIONS.* The idea occurred, at the same time, to two gentlemen, (both of them particular friends of mine,) without any previous intercourse with each other, who afterwards co-operated in carrying it into execution. Between the first conception of the plan, by one of these gentlemen, and the communication

tion of it to the public, by means of an advertisement, an interval of little more than eight and forty hours occurred. Mr. Reeves was requested to take the chair, not because he held a place under government, but because he had first called the attention of the public to the subject; and being known to be perfectly well qualified for the station, and having also, on this occasion, proved himself to be a vigilant and steady friend to the constitution, it never occurred to those who requested him to preside, that either his merits, or his interest in the public welfare, had suffered any diminution from his having been deemed worthy of confidence, in being appointed to fill a public station. Several gentlemen, anxious for the support of the laws and constitution, voluntarily stepped forward, and a committee was formed. No means, whatever, except a fair and candid exposition of the principles and motives by which the friends to the project were actuated, were employed to procure adherents. The success of the measure evinced the public sense of the purity of those principles, and of those motives; and the first associators soon experienced that heart-felt satisfaction which results from the approbation of the loyal and the censures of the disaffected.

But I must again observe, that from the first moment in which the plan was conceived, to the present hour, government has not afforded the smallest assistance, support, or protection, directly or indirectly, to any of the loyal associations: they were established without any kind of communication with government, and have remained entirely independent of, and unconnected with, it. All the expences attending them have been defrayed by the

Q

voluntary

voluntary contributions of the members. This, my Lord, is the true state of the case, which I defy you or any man to controvert.—Your assertion, therefore, is wholly unfounded in fact.

How the associations can resemble “the hated forms of French anarchy,” cannot easily be conceived. The Jacobin clubs in France were notoriously established, for the express purpose of controuling the executive and legislative powers, and of dictating laws to them; whereas the avowed object of the English associations was to enforce obedience to the laws; and one of their fundamental rules was, always to act *in subordination to the magistrate, and the executive government, and in their aid and support, and not otherwise*. I am apt to believe, that your Lordship has made a trifling mistake, and meant to apply the observation to those clubs which had adopted the use of French forms and French terms, and had displayed their predilection for French principles. It is but justice to the loyal associations to observe, that their leading members are men who yield not to your Lordship, nor to the proudest of your associates, in independence of principle, purity of intention, or integrity of conduct.* The kingdom

* Dr. Knox, in a publication, the professed object of which is to repel the shafts of calumny, has himself acted the part of a calumniator, with respect to the members of the loyal associations, whom he has had the audacity to represent, as a body of *informers*,—the pests of society.” I have too great a respect for his *profession* to apply *appropriate* terms to this wanton assertion: an admonition to avoid insolence and falsehood might appear superfluous, when directed to a minister of religion. From the same motive I forbear to *characterize* a publication, in which, I am sorry to say, may be seen much of the *language* of christianity, but little of the *spirit*. Dr. Knox has also contributed to the propagation of that wicked misrepresentation of an expression of Mr. Burke’s, which I have before noticed—*The swinish multitude*.

has already experienced the beneficial effects of their exertions; their constitutional vigilance is still preserved: and should ever the daring hand of faction presume to hoist the bloody standard of revolt; the disaffected will find in *them*, a steady and determined foe, resolved to vanquish every enemy to the laws and constitution, or to perish beneath the ruins of the state.

It has been urged by you, and still more pointedly by Mr. Sheridan, that the difference between the governments and laws of France and England, was such as to preclude the possibility of danger to England, from the example of France. Admitting what I have already disproved, that the laws of the latter country were really as bad as you and Mr. Sheridan represented them, and the oppressions really as enormous, still your conclusion is false.— If the attempts to alienate the minds of the people, (I mean of the lower class, for it is essential in discussing a question of this nature, not to be misunderstood, by confounding, as has too often been the case, the *plebs* with the *populus*;) if these attempts, I say, had been confined to appeals to their *judgment*; if *reason* had been suffered to be the sole judge; the observation might have been just, as little grounds for apprehension of danger could have existed. But a very different mode was pursued: the projectors of the scheme endeavoured to mislead by artful appeals to the *passions*. The laws holden out to the people were an augmentation of power, a diminution of taxes, an increase of the price of provisions;* and, in some places, an equalization of
of

* The wretched state of France, where no money can purchase a sufficiency of the necessaries of life, has been carefully
concealed

of property. These were objects that spoke forcibly to the *senses*, and the aid of *reason* was rejected, as only capable of exposing the delusion. Hold out these objects to the people of *any* country, let the government be what it will, and the man who will seriously affirm that no danger to the state is to be apprehended, will betray the grossest ignorance of human nature. These were the objects which, more than any defects in the government, seduced the people of France from their allegiance; and, but for the timely interposition of the executive and legislative powers, the same causes would, pro-

concealed from the lower class of people in this country. Of that wretchedness, some idea may be formed, from the following comparative statement of the price of provisions, at Rouen, the capital of the fertile province of Normandy, in the year preceding the Revolution, and in the month of February in the present year.

In 1798.	In 1795.
Bread, a loaf of three pounds, 3d. 4.	10d. a pound, and expected to be worth 5s. before harvest, the stock of corn being nearly exhausted.
Meat, per pound, 4d. ½.	From 3s. to 4s.
A small fowl, 1s. 3d.	12s.
A turkey, 2s. 6d.	1l. 8s.

I have the authority of the Convention for asserting, that an alarming rise in the price of every article of consumption has taken place throughout the distracted kingdom of France. On the 12th of January, 1795, the united committees made a report to the Convention in which the necessity of increasing the salary of the members, from 18 to 36 livres a day, was enforced, on the plea that 18 livres in 1789 were equal to 60 livres in 1795, from the increased price of every article of consumption. If this were the case in Paris, where the necessity of preserving tranquillity among the perturbed spirits of the capital has, from the year 1789 to the present time, induced the revolutionary leaders, to procure, by means the most tyrannical and expensive, a supply of the provisions, &c. for the inhabitants at the expence of the provinces; it is easily conceived, that the evil must be felt in a much greater degree in the country.

bably

bably have produced the same effects in England; for the people of all countries are, in certain respects, the *same*.

In stating the effects of the war, you are nearly as correct as you are in your account of its origin. You say, that by engaging in the war, *we* have given to the French "the habit and taste for military enterprize," in direct contradiction to what you had before asserted, "that the habit of the love " of military glory and enterprize," was entwined with the monarchy of France. Our acquisitions in the West Indies you represent as of little consequence; though we have lately been told from authority, that the annual returns of the conquered islands amount to no less than ten millions sterling; and indeed no one can be ignorant of their value, who has perused the philosophical and political history of the Indies, by the Abbé Raynal, though not the most *correct* author that has written upon the subject. You state the loss of the allies, during the last campaign, to be 150,000 men; I *believe* the account to be exaggerated, though as you produce no vouchers in support of the statement, it is not possible to define its accuracy: at all events it would have been but candid, to place the loss of the French in opposition to our own. That, indeed, would not have answered *your* purpose; but I shall endeavour to supply the deficiency, as far as I am able. Some months ago, a report was made to the convention, by one of its committees, in which the loss of men sustained by the French, during the war, was specified:—to the best of my recollection, for I have not the account immediately before me, it consisted of 610,000 killed and made prisoners; 53,000, who

who died in the military hospital; and 67,000 deserters:—119,000 of those who had been put in requisition had *refused* to join the army. In this account, which no one will suspect to be *exaggerated*, were not included the losses of the last campaign in Spain and Savoy, and before Mentz, nor those which were sustained in the acquisition of Holland. These last I have heard estimated at between 40 and 50,000 men, including such as perished by disease; and when we consider the numerous skirmishes that took place in the Spanish dominions; and the resolute defence of Rosas, in particular, the amount of the former must be considerable. In short, their loss has greatly exceeded the gross amount of all the troops employed against them, in every quarter, from the commencement of the war to the present time.

But, notwithstanding this immense loss of men, notwithstanding the loss of, at least, thirty sail of the line, notwithstanding the loss of her colonies in the East and West Indies, and notwithstanding the annihilation of her trade, commerce,* and manufactures, you have the confidence to assert, that “*France exhibits herself more powerful than before the contest.*” So that her power increases, as its sources become exhausted! You must have a strange opinion of your constituents, my Lord, to suppose that they can become the dupes of such an assertion.

* “The commerce of France, exhibits only ruins and fragments.”—*Lindet’s report*—“Our manufactures languish, our maritime trade is destroyed, and the armies are the only consumers!—Disorder shakes the very foundation of society in the interior.” *Pelet’s speech in the Convention*, on the 9th of April, 1795.

Farther

Farther to dispirit the nation, you represent us as fighting against an enemy, not only eminently powerful, but firmly united amongst themselves.—We are, according to your account, struggling against “*the declared will of twenty-five millions of men, in a state of revolutionary enthusiasm.*” In the first place, you have exaggerated the present population of France, nearly THREE MILLIONS beyond its amount, before it had sustained the astonishing diminution produced by the revolution and the war. I am in possession of a detailed account of the number of inhabitants in 1789, which I have every reason to believe authentic; by which it appears that it amounted, at that time, to no more than 22,014,300.

But, waving all conclusions to be drawn from this *trifling* inaccuracy, I should be glad to be informed *how and when* this *declared will* of all the inhabitants of France, men, women, and children, was collected. The last time I recollect any *free and voluntary* declaration of the sentiments of the French nation, it was made in favour of the unfortunate King, when, after his unsuccessful attempt to escape the desperate machinations of the republican faction had endangered his life:—*then seventy-six* Departments, out of *eighty-three*, voluntarily stepped forth, and openly declared their determination to monarchical constitution, and the inviolability of the sovereign.* The fact is, that every great political convulsion, which has occurred in France, since the year 1788, has been brought about by a *minority*; it was a minority which effected the revolution; it was a minority which

* See “*Histoire de la Conspiration du 10 Aout, 1792,*” par le Comte Bigot de Sainte Croix.

accomplished

accomplished the deposition of the King; it was a minority which achieved the downfall of the Brissotin faction; and it was a minority that completed the destruction of the Robespierrean party.*

This "declared will of twenty-five millions of *men*," is a chimera of your own creation. But you go still farther, and gravely declare it *absurd*, to conceive that the pecuniary contributions of the people, and their rising in a mass, are *involuntary*. ---That I may not be suspected of having misrepresented you, I will quote your own words.---
 "When we view the enthusiasm they have displayed
 "on every occasion, when we consider their general feeling as a people, and their conviction of the
 "nature of the contest in which they were embarked; that they should *give* their money, and
 "offer their lives, cannot be astonishing.---To conceive it *involuntary* is absurd, and is *contradicted*
 "by their uniform conduct in the field, &c." Without stopping to admire the grammatical accuracy, and classical construction of this passage, I must confess that, if it do not amount to a positive assertion that the Convention is enabled to

* The Abbé Sieyès, who has successively served every party, and has yet contrived, by his art, to save his neck from the guillotine, in his speech of the 7th of March, 1795, adverting to the revolution of the thirty-first of May, 1793, which overthrew the Girondin party, and brought Brissot and many of his associates to the scaffold, said—"At that fatal epoch you saw the convention decimated; the *majority* made to pass under the yoke, the *minority* reigned." Many other authorities might be cited in support of my observation.—May the example of France, in this respect, prove a warning to England! and preserve her from the mischiefs, which a desperate and unprincipled minority, with the single aid of occasion, are capable of producing.

carry on the war by the *free gifts* and *voluntary services* of the people, I am unable to comprehend its meaning:—but when connected with the assertion, that we are opposing “the declared will of twenty-five millions of men;” I defy any one to say it will bear a different interpretation. Thus all the oppressive exertions, of which we have read are chimerical; and we are to believe, that the tyrannical requisitions of the Convention amount to nothing more than simple instructions to beat up for volunteers. Indeed, my Lord, if your *rank* did not, in the opinion of many, attach to your sentiments and assertions, a degree of consequence, which, without that advantage they could not possibly command; did it not dispose numbers to rely on the superiority of your information; and, blind to your errors and contradictions, implicitly to believe what you positively affirm, I should deem it an insult to the common sense of the public, to enter into a serious confutation of absurdities so gross.

The state of the French finances, and the means by which the treasury of the republic is filled, are so fully explained in the admirable speech of Lord Mornington; a speech most eminently distinguished for sound sense, solid reasoning, and useful information—that I shall say very little upon the subject. To shew the correctness of your assertion, it is only necessary to state that the Convention has itself made a distinction, in its fiscal operations, between a *voluntary* loan, and a *forced* loan. The subscription for a loan that was opened on the 24th of August, 1793, was called a *voluntary* loan; and the loan established by a decree passed on the third of the following month, was termed, with singular propriety, a *forced* loan. The money exacted from the people, by this oppressive measure, amounted to no less than

one third of the annual produce of the aggregate capital of every individual in the kingdom, as specified by the Convention itself. According to that statement, the whole annual income of the French nation amounted to one hundred and twenty millions sterling; and the amount of the forced loan was forty millions. The terms of the loan, and the mode of ascertaining the different proportions of individuals, were truly characteristic of republican liberality. *No interest* was allowed; and not any part of the capital was to be repaid until the term of two years after the peace, when the subscribers were to be reimbursed, not in money, but in *national domains*. Commissioners were appointed to ascertain the amount of every man's income, and each individual was bound to declare the name and residence of all his creditors.—A person who had an annual income of forty pounds sterling, was rated at four pounds.—A progressive augmentation of one tenth upon every forty pounds sterling then took place, so that a man, who possessed four hundred pounds a year, was obliged to contribute two hundred and twenty pounds: in consequence of which, no man could enjoy, during the existence of this impost, a greater income than one hundred and eighty pounds; all above four hundred pounds being *absolutely* appropriated to the exigencies of the state. No species of property whatever was exempted: even money in a banker's hands, and the profits of trade, were included in this enormous plan of general extortion; which, be it observed, was adopted because the people, who are described by your Lordship, as *giving* their money, *refused to subscribe to the VOLUNTARY loan**. But, notwithstanding measures, more
rigorous

* To the notice of those friends to the French Revolution, who have so strenuously maintained, that all the declarations of the
French

rigorous and oppressive than any which appear in the annals of the most despotic governments, were adopted to enforce the decree;—so indisposed were the people to submit to it, that the *forced* loan proved extremely unproductive, and other means, if possible more tyrannical, were resorted to for the purpose of supplying the deficiency.

The *same* degree of alacrity have these generous republicans displayed, in *offering* their lives, as in *giving* their money to the state. It will not, I apprehend, be denied, that if the enthusiastic eagerness you describe had existed, and every man had been disposed to turn out as a volunteer, there could be no possible necessity for passing rigorous laws, in order to *compel* the people to serve; nor will it be contended, that the national convention was not fully competent to decide how far that enthusiasm did really exist, and whether there was an actual necessity for supplying the want of it, by the adoption of compulsory measures. Having established this position, which cannot be controverted, it will suffice to shew that such laws have been passed, and such measures enforced, to prove that the ground you have taken is untenable, and your assertion unfounded in fact.

At the latter end of August, 1793, the convention decreed that every man in France, between the age of eighteen and that of fifty, should join the army, *at the requisition of the national commissioners*. To render this law, which was enforced with a de-

French on the subject of *equality*, only applied to the *equality of civil and political rights*—I beg leave to recommend the declaration of the Convention, on the subject of the forced loan, in which they avow, that their object was “*to reduce the level of equality, by gentle ways, those FORTUNES which had risen above it*” How ungrateful are these men, thus incessantly to contradict the assertions of their most ardent supporters!

gree of rigour, unexampled in any civilized country, more effective, another law was passed soon after, by which every father and mother were bound to declare the place of abode of their children, summoned by requisition, for the service of the army; and every citizen was forbidden to conceal any person under requisition:---the soldiers of the revolutionary army were authorized to arrest all persons who should appear to them to have been put in requisition; and to lodge them in jail, if they endeavoured to escape:---and the proper officers were enjoined to search every house twice a week, in order to discover any person who might seek to elude the requisition. By a subsequent law, every person who shall impede the levy of the army, by words or otherwise, was subjected to the punishment of *death*. Such are the *glorious* laws which have been passed by the representatives of that people, who are so ready to *offer* their lives, and whose services and contributions it would be *absurd* to suppose, are *involuntary*! In consequence of these laws, “not only no parent can venture even to
 “advise his children to remain at home, but in most
 “parts of the republic, the executioner has been
 “the recruiting serjeant; and the unfortunate peasants and labourers in the provinces have been
 “compelled to make their option, between the
 “perils of battle, and the unerring stroke of the
 “guillotine.” Enthusiasm, *thus* inspired, must prove alike ardent and durable.—Many insurrections have happened, and, notwithstanding the numerous executions employed to suppress them, no less than 119,000 of those who were put in requisition, have, as I have before shewn, according to the statement of the Convention, refused to serve; and numbers of them joined the Chouans and the Royalists, in La Vendée.

Having

Having proved the reverse of your proposition to be true, I shall call upon your Lordship to reconcile what appears to me to be a most palpable contradiction.—In your first letter, (p. 85,) speaking of the French, you say, “*Their's was a government that found resources in robbery and murder.*” This is a just observation. But it is certainly contradicted, by the assertion upon which I have commented, tending to show that the contributions of the people are *voluntary*, in which case the resources of the government could not be said to consist in *robbery* and murder. It is material to observe, too, that this assertion appears in your *last* letter, which was written at a subsequent period, though published at the same time as the first.

Your declaration, too, that the military services of the people were voluntary, appears to be contradicted by a subsequent passage, in which you observe, that, before we can act *on equal terms* with the French, “every man must *by compulsion become a soldier,*”---“*our lives and fortunes must be in a state of requisition.*” Here it is evidently admitted, that every man in France is *by compulsion* a soldier, and that in France, the lives and fortunes of the inhabitants are in a state of requisition; and such admission is surely a contradiction to the declaration, that the people make a voluntary *offer* of their lives.

Anxious to find an excuse, even for the most exceptionable measures of the French Republicans, you more than *insinuate*, that the enormous crimes they have committed, which will brand them to the latest posterity, with indelible infamy, were, in some degree, the consequence of *our conduct* towards them. “How far,” you say, “our own
“conduct

“conduct may have in part occasioned the very
 “scenes we deplore, and the very horrors we de-
 “precate, I have avoided entering upon.” As an
 Englishman, feeling for the honour of my country,
 I cannot but reprobate the groundless insinuation;
 and dare you to show, by a candid exhibition of
facts, and by fair reasoning, *how* the publick con-
 duct of this nation has contributed to the
 commission of the enormities to which you al-
 lude. It is not the first time your *party on prin-*
ciple have endeavoured to palliate the infamous pro-
 ceedings of our enemies, by ascribing them, at one
 time, to the opposition they have provoked from
 the powers, whom a principle of self-preservation
 has compelled to combine against them *; and, at
 another, to the oppressions they experienced under
 the ancient government. But all these imputations
 are equally false. Look at the basis of the Revo-
 lution; look at the columns by which the hideous
 fabric is supported; look at the laws to which it has
 given birth; there will you find the true sources of
 all the horrors we reprobate. Crimes and enormi-
 ties are the legitimate offspring of a government
 founded in rebellion, perjury, rapine, and murder.
 If, indeed, any foreign stimulus had been wanting,
 it was most naturally to be looked for in the con-
 duct of *the disaffected* in this country, who cer-
 tainly encouraged the French to proceed in the per-

* Whoever wants any proof of the falsehood of this imputa-
 tion, may be supplied with sufficient, by referring to two late
 publications, one of which is entitled “Observations on the Emi-
 gration of Dr. Joseph Priestley, and on the several Addresses de-
 livered to him on his arrival at New-York.” The other is called
 —“A short Account of the late Revolution in Geneva; and of
 the Conduct of France towards that Republic, from October
 1792, to October 1794, by Francis D’Ivernois, Esq.” Both
 these pamphlets are worthy the attention of every Englishman.

petration of fresh crimes, by bestowing unqualified commendations on those they had already committed; and in the speeches of certain degenerate senators, who seem to admire their wisdom, and to exult in the success of their undertakings.

The same motive which impelled you to magnify the power and resources of the French, probably operated upon your mind, as an inducement to depreciate our own; and it might naturally be expected, that the jaundiced eye of party, which could descry integrity in the publick conduct of France, and prosperity in the present state of that country, would discern in our own conduct the distorted features of injustice, and in the state of the kingdom, calamity and distress. You exhort us to avert our eyes from the situation of our enemy, and to contemplate our own distress, which you are careful to exaggerate. But the exhortation is insidious, and your statement of the question is neither candid nor fair. The language of a *true* patriot would be different indeed; he would not seek to excite despondency where courage is required, nor to stimulate discontent where unanimity is essential to success. He would rather say to his countrymen—"The war, in which we
 " have been *compelled* to engage, was originally
 " undertaken with a view to repel an aggression
 " unjust and unprovoked; its object, on our part,
 " is self-preservation; a dereliction of every principle which, in *this* country consecrates the freedom of individuals, and the rights of property,
 " has rendered our enemy more formidable for a
 " time than we had any reason to expect he would
 " become; our exertions must be proportionably
 " great; our contributions proportionably liberal;
 " —'tis true, the necessary imposition of additional
 " taxes

“ taxes cannot but be felt, but the recollection that
 “ we are only making the sacrifice of a part for
 “ the preservation of the whole, that we are fight-
 “ ing in defence of all that Britons have ever
 “ been accustomed to regard as more precious
 “ than fortune or even life itself—that not only
 “ our national importance, but our liberties,
 “ our very existence, as an independent state,
 “ are involved in the contest; this recollection,
 “ I say, should induce us not patiently to submit
 “ to, but chearfully to meet, the difficulties we
 “ have to encounter. Our confidence should be
 “ proportioned to the justice of our cause; our
 “ efforts to the extent of our danger. The man
 “ who shrinks from his duty in the hour of ca-
 “ lamity is a traitor to his country—undismayed
 “ by disasters, yield not to despair, but seek a
 “ remedy in additional vigour of exertion.—At
 “ such a period as the present, the motto of every
 “ true Briton, should be

“ Ne tu cede malis ; sed contra audentior ito.”

Such language as this, my Lord, would do more
 honour to your party than all their attempts to
acquire power.—You, however, are of a different
 opinion, and seem to think that honour is to be
 acquired by attempts to blast the character of our
 ministers, and to render our country contemptible
 in the eyes of foreign powers. Our conduct to
 neutral states is reprobated by you in terms of vio-
 lence proportioned to their injustice. You, indeed,
 condescend to acknowledge, that, in the conduct
 of France to the Italian powers *in the year 1792*,
 much may be found to blame; but, if your igno-
 rance of French affairs had not been as gross as
 your

your prejudice against ministers is inveterate, you might have discovered, in the conduct of France to the neutral powers, not only *much to blame*, but sufficient to *justify our own conduct to those powers*. Our conduct to Genoa, which you describe as an act of *oppression*, was a necessary measure of defence: *four and fifty millions of livres* had been expended by the French, with a view to render the republic of Genoa subservient to France, that ample supplies for the Southern provinces might be secured, and a road opened for the projected conquest of Italy. The minister, who, being in possession of these facts, had neglected to employ all the means in his power for defeating such dangerous schemes, would have deserved to lose his head. But, spite of every precaution, the French agents completed one part of their mission, by obtaining such quantities of corn as enabled their armies to retake Toulon and Marseilles, to preserve Nice, and to maintain the peace and union of the Southern departments.

The neutral powers, instead of being influenced, in their observance of neutrality, by a regard for the welfare and happiness of their subjects, as they have ~~falsely~~ pretended, are solely actuated by a sordid spirit of avarice; submitting to the degradation of receiving *bribes* from the executive power of France, and thereby sharing in the spoils of plundered honour, and murdered innocence.

Read the account of the revolution at Geneva, and you will find that the conduct of the French, not only in 1792, but in 1793, and 1794, also, was such as violated every principle of neutrality; you will find, that they sacrificed every principle they had professed, at the shrines of interest and ambition, and that, setting at defiance the rights of na-

tions and the laws of humanity, they first wantonly attacked, and then inhumanly oppressed, a free, friendly, and independent state.

But what were the maxims of the *moderates*, the Brissotin party, with respect to neutral powers? Your friend's friend, *Kersaint*, shall answer the question—"our interest requires, that, in this struggle, *there should be no neutrals*, and, if we are obliged to it, I propose that we shall make this general proclamation addressed to all nations—that, in a war of kings against men, *we can only acknowledge friends or enemies*.—Policy dictates this resolution*."—Such was the policy of the "*timid and enlightened* Brissotin ministry!"—I am well aware that one act of *injustice* does not sanction the commission of another; but I contend, that our conduct to the neutral powers has been not only directed by the all paramount principle of self-preservation, but conformable to the dictates of honour and the laws of nations.

In the unnatural attempt to excite a general odium against your country, you endeavour to alienate from our government the minds of the emigrants, who, you say, "must view with disgust the iniquity of our proceedings." But, I know those emigrants, (at least the honorable and loyal part of them,) better than your Lordship; I know the sentiments with which the conduct of this nation inspires their minds to be the sentiments of gratitude and esteem; and, if there be any object which they "view with disgust,"

* See Kersaint's speech in the Convention, on the subject of declaring war against England. *Debrett's collection of Addresses*, &c. p. 123.

it is the conduct of yourself and your political associates, whose efforts they justly regard as having a manifest tendency to injure their cause, and to promote the success of their bitterest enemies.

It is a circumstance too extraordinary to be the effect of accident, that, while all the neutral powers are taught by you, and your party, to consider themselves as oppressed and insulted by us, all those states which are in alliance with us, are objects of your inveterate abuse. I will not admit the supposition that the *intent* of such conduct is to deprive us of our allies, and to urge the neutral powers *openly* to espouse the cause of our enemies, because I cannot suppose that in a British senate there can exist a mind so unprincipled, so profligate, so depraved, as to harbour such a wicked intention; but that it has a direct tendency to effect that purpose, no man, I think, can deny.

At all events, one inevitable consequence of the line of conduct you have adopted, as well in this respect, as in the exaggeration of *our* distress, and of the resources of the *French*, is the discouragement of the people of this country, and the infusion of fresh vigour into the minds of our enemies. In short, your party have supplied the foe with arms against ourselves. Their speeches are quoted by the best informed and most intelligent among them, in support of their own statements; and they are honoured, by those enlightened philosophers, with commendations proportioned to their zeal.---*Publicola Chaussard*, to whose acquaintance I have already introduced your Lordship, in his speech to "the society of Friends to Liberty and Equality," at Antwerp, drew the following curious picture of England, copied, according to him, with

the greatest fidelity, from an *English original*:--
 “ Shall I describe England, a nation shut out from
 “ the rest of the world by its insular situation, en-
 “ joying only a precarious existence, resting on the
 “ void of fictitious credit ; a nation armed with
 “ bank-paper, which the blast of events may de-
 “ stroy ; a nation, that, with one foot already in the
 “ abyss of bankruptcy, still dares to threaten us ?
 “ Do not say that this picture is overcharged, be-
 “ cause it is drawn by a Frenchman. *Enlightened*
 “ *English philosophers ; orators of the House of*
 “ *Commons*, STANHOPE, FOX, GREY, &c. I call
 “ in the evidence of your more energetic expres-
 “ sions ; I appeal to that confession which the
 “ force of things and the interest of your country
 “ have extorted from you.”

Another instance of republican gratitude appears in the speech of your friend Brissot, on the 12th of January, 1793. “ *Fox*, he says, must be praised
 “ for having dared to urge the sending of an am-
 “ bassador to France ; *Sheridan* must be praised
 “ for having exculpated the nation from those
 “ massacres which are merely the work of a few un-
 “ principled men ; and *Erskine* must be praised for
 “ having dared to defend *Thomas Paine* *.”—Had
 Brissot lived till this time, with how many more
 subjects for commendation would the conduct of
 this *patriotic triumvirate* have supplied him !
 There are minds, I know, *little* enough to be grati-
 fied with *such* praise ; and one of the triumviri has,
 I believe, a taste to relish, and a stomach to digest,
 any incense, however gross and fulsome, that is of-
 fered up at the shrine of his vanity ; for my part,
 having been accustomed to regard the commenda-

* *Memoires Historiques et Politiques*, &c. p. 129.

tions of such men as have swayed the councils of France, since the revolution, as the greatest possible disgrace, I cannot envy *their* feelings who derive gratification from a source so contaminated. Rather let me be gratified with the more honourable approbation of my *countrymen*; and, though I know how to prize the applause of a just and generous foe, may I ever be *honoured* with the *hatred* of rebels and regicides!

For the reasons I have already explained, and others which it is needless to repeat, I am free to confess, that if the same question were put to me, as was put to the House of Commons, by Mr. Sheridan, substituting your party in the aggregate, in the place of an individual member, I should, without hesitation, adopt the memorable reply of a worthy member of the House of Commons---“ *If a number of gentlemen wished to shew themselves favourable to the French cause, as those who wished success to the pretender did in 1745, I think they would adopt a line of conduct very similar to that which has been shewn by you*” since the first prospect of a rupture with France. It is evident the French themselves would, without circumlocution, answer the question in the affirmative*.

The

* The question put by Mr. Sheridan was this— “ *Am I supposed to be a favourer of the French?*” The gentleman who made the reply was Mr. Yorke, the member for Cambridgeshire. In support of my assertion, that the French would have answered Mr. Sheridan’s question in the affirmative, I have extracted the following passage from an Address, composed by *Soulavie*, the French resident at Geneva, and presented to that party at Geneva which was distinguished by the appellation of the *mountaineers*, the members of which, like the mountaineers of France, after they had established a *sanguinary* revolution in their native country, were sacrificed to the vengeance of those very men who had participated

The conclusion you draw from your various positions, in the last of your letters, betrays the object of their publication; and, the robe of patriotism being thrown aside, we plainly discover the cloven foot of party. After stating the country to be verging apace to its ruin, you observe that its prosperity, “*under different men*, and by pursuing different “ measures, might still be preserved,” and then pronounce an eulogy on Mr. Fox, and represent *him* as the only man able to save the state from destruction. With a view to impress this idea more forcibly upon the minds of your readers, you declare it to be impossible for the present ministers to treat with France, and on this subject, remark, that “ in “ the submissions Mr. Pitt would have forced upon “ France, we may form a competent judgment of “ the terms that he will have it in his power to “ make”—a *patriotic* hint to the French, to insist on the subversion of our constitution, which I have no doubt, should Providence ever give them the ability, they will be perfectly disposed to adopt. But, my Lord, do you imagine that Englishmen would ever submit to the degradation of having a mini-

participated in their crimes, and with the approbation of that same populace, who had loudly applauded the very acts for which they were condemned, thereby exemplifying the justness of Danton’s remark, previous to his execution at Paris.—“ Every “ revolution, *of the same nature as our own*, is like Saturn; it devours its own offspring.”

“ The good-will of the mountaineers towards France,”—said Soulavie—“ exposes them to all the malignity of the enemies of “ that nation, who imprison them, calumniate them, oppress “ them by unjust prosecutions, and do all in their power to “ disunite them, by dividing them into new clubs, *exactly in the “ same manner as PITT persecutes the opposition in England*, FOR “ FAVOURING THE CAUSE OF FRANCE.”—*A Short account of the late revolution in Geneva, &c.—by Francis d’Ivernois, Esq.* p. 47.

stry

stry imposed on their sovereign by the republic of France? Not, I trust, while there remains in the island an arm to wield a sword, or a guinea to buy one.

In one respect, I am willing to acknowledge the Brissotin ministry were *enlightened*; they had acquired, no matter *how*, a degree of knowledge that enabled them to appreciate the views of opposition, and the principles of some of its leaders. Kersaint's remarks on this subject are curious;---the following extracts I recommend to your particular attention.

—"The ambition and the genius of Mr. Fox, and the intrigues of opposition, who take advantage of every event that tends to diminish the popularity of the English minister; who, having artfully encouraged hopes and expectations of reform, *in order to agitate the minds of the people*, have converted those hopes and those expectations into fears and apprehensions.---Mr. Fox has but one object in view, that of hurling his rival from his throne, and of retrieving at once so many parliamentary defeats, not less injurious to his interest than inimical to his reputation *."

Yet this is the statesman on whose sleeve you have pinned your political faith; you claim no merit but what can result from your adoption of his creed; from the imitation of his conduct; you assume no splendour but such as is reflected by the rays of his genius.---Super-eminence modesty!---After reviling the *folly* of a man, whose capacious mind exhibits the most brilliant combination of genius and talents; after censuring the *ignorance* of men of the first abilities in the kingdom, you throw

* Kersaint's speech in the Convention, on the subject of the war with England. *Collection of Addresses, &c.* p. 115.

yourself

yourself at the feet of Mr. Fox, whose public conduct exhibits the utmost extremes of political inconsistency---whose parliamentary orations, from his first entrance into public life to the present moment, display a series of contradictions, on questions of high political importance, that are wonderfully characteristic of “ a *party-man upon principle*.”---Unparalleled humility!

But, know, my Lord, that *independence* is the noblest characteristic of an English mind; it is the best passport to power, and affords the fairest claim to distinction. A British noble should disdain to rank with the vulgar herd of imitators---*Imitatorum servum pecus*;---his voluntary exertions, directed exclusively to the public weal, should supply him with a purer source of approbation than any that can be derived from a slavish attachment to the tenets of another; besides, to found your pretensions to public applause on the reputation of another, is both pitiful and dangerous;

*Miserum est aliorum incumbere famæ,
Ne collapsa ruant subductis tecta columnis,
Stratus humi palmes viduas desiderat ulmos.*

But individual independence is of little consequence when compared with national independence, to the preservation of which all our efforts should now be directed. I have proved, from the confessions of every party which has successively swayed the councils of France, that the war is, on the part of our enemies, a war of aggression, a war of conquest, a war of annihilation:---that, on our part, it is, in the strictest application of the term, a war of self-defence, a war which has for its object, the preservation, not only of our political independence,
but

but of our laws, our religion, our constitution, our national rights, as Britons, our social comforts, as men. As it originated in necessity, so does necessity imperiously prescribe its continuance; until the grand object for which we contend shall be obtained, by the solid establishment of a peace, concluded on honourable terms, and calculated to be permanent.---That no *such* peace can be concluded with the present mock-government of France, must, I think, appear evident, to all who have marked the progress of the revolution with an attentive eye.---In vain do they uphold a system of *comparative* moderation.---I have shewn that with them originated those projects of aggrandizement, which threaten with destruction the balance of power in Europe; and those schemes of *emancipation*, which tend to disorganize the social system, and to annihilate all existing governments.---I have shewn that their object is the same as that of the Jacobins, and differs only in the mode of attainment. I have shewn also, that the present rulers cherish the same inveterate animosity against this country, as was displayed by the partisans of Brissot, and the followers of Robespierre.---I have proved that they have, themselves, by the annexation of the territories of our allies to the dominions of the republic, thrown obstacles in the way of a peace, which they not only evince no disposition to remove, but betray a settled determination to preserve.---And I have farther proved, by the frequent violations of their faith, solemnly plighted and deliberately broken, that no confidence can be reposed in them.---With men so unprincipled, with a government so unstable, no permanent peace can, I contend, be concluded. *Brissot* has justly observed,—“ There is no making an alliance,—there is

no *treating* with Anarchy * ?” That desirable object, probably *most* desired by those who say the least about it, can only be attained by a vigorous prosecution of the war.

Though we cannot controul the course of events, nor direct the chances of war, yet I cannot foresee any situation to which we can possibly be reduced, so disastrous as to extort from us an acknowledgement of the French republic; an acknowledgement pregnant with such infinite danger as almost to amount to a political suicide†.—Should our efforts be crowned with success, and the issue of the contest be such as to enable us to prescribe the terms of accommodation, our interest, the interest of Europe, evidently demands the restoration of the ANCIENT MONARCHY. The idea of *despotism* has been erroneously attached to that constitution, although it has,

* See his address to his Constituents, Translation, p. 109.

† Mr. Sheridan has declared, in a late debate, that he wishes to see a Republic, *one and indivisible*, established in France, and that this wish is influenced by a regard for his country.—*Credat Judæus!*—But the public have been so much accustomed to Mr. Sheridan’s declarations and *counter* declarations, that they know how to appreciate them.—I shall not, therefore, bestow a single comment on the subject.—

In the same speech, Mr. S. said—“ If also we destroyed the present government (of France) it would always remain undecided, whether its principles were such as surrounding nations could have confidence in.”—I have proved that the present government of France is actuated by principles of aggression, aggrandizement, and proselytism; principles displayed, in the most unequivocal manner, in its public declarations, and in its conduct to foreign states—Principles which are hostile to the independence of every existing Government.—But this *prudent*, this *able*, this *experienced* statesman, would have us suffer the unlimited extension of such principles, and risk the peace, happiness, and welfare of Europe, by a political experiment, in compliment to the super-eminent wisdom of the revolutionary sages of France!—Who, after this, can doubt that this man is a steady friend to England, and an inveterate enemy to France?

by one of the best writers on the subject of political establishments, been expressly distinguished from an arbitrary government. Undeluded alike by the misrepresentations of some men, and by the misapprehensions of others, I take *history* for the basis of my opinion, and, in support of it, will cite the authority of an illustrious author, whose manly declarations have exempted him from the imputation of flattery or disguise, and whose complete and perfect knowledge of the subject, no one will venture to dispute. “ If—says the president Montesquieu—“ France has, for two or three centuries past, incessantly augmented her power; such augmentation must not be ascribed to Fortune, *but to the excellence of her laws* *.” Such was the declaration of a magistrate, employed in the administration of those laws; such was the declaration of a writer, who had studied the laws of all civilized nations. A more satisfactory and complete refutation of all the libels written and uttered, on the laws of the ancient monarchy of France, could not possibly be framed †.

Though a steady friend to the constitution of
my

* De L'Esprit des Loix; Liv. 20, Chap. 20. Edition, en douze; de 1769.

† It may, perhaps, be said, that good laws may exist in a despotic government, but their existence, depending on the will of an individual, must be too precarious to afford a prospect of permanency. Montesquieu, however, has classed France among the monarchical states, in contra-distinction to despotic or absolute governments; the excellence of her laws, therefore, he must have considered as a proof of the soundness of her constitution.

It is rather singular, that neither your Lordship, nor any of your political associates, who declaim so violently against the old government of France, should have accepted Mr. Burke's challenge, contained in the following passage of his speech, in the House of Commons, on the 14th of April, 1794.

my country, and firmly convinced that it is the best possible constitution for England; I am by no means of opinion, that it is equally well adapted to France, or that it would be even practicable there. A determined foe to the prevailing spirit of *profelytism*, I should be the last man to sacrifice more important considerations, to a spirit of national vanity, by prescribing to all the nations of the earth, the same code of laws, and the same form of government. Aware of the necessity of consulting manners, habits, climate, and a thousand other local and relative circumstances, in the formation of a complicated system, calculated to direct the discordant interests and contending passions of individuals, to the promotion of the general welfare, I should deplore the infatuation which would reject the salutary lessons of experience, for the wild speculations of visionary theorists. But, in wishing for the restoration of the ancient monarchy of France, from a thorough conviction, that that system of government is best calculated, not only to secure the general interests of Europe, but to promote the welfare and happiness of the French people, I must not be supposed to wish for the re-

“ To advert to the much abused ancient government of France.
 “ Throughout the whole of Louis the XVIth's reign, I defy any
 “ one to produce me an instance of injustice, or the violation of
 “ private right. The only thing approaching to it was in a case
 “ between the Crown and the Corporation of Bordeaux, on a
 “ question of alluvion relative to some land on the river Loire.
 “ This was seized on by the ministers as the property of the
 “ Crown: on an application, however, to the King in Council,
 “ from the Corporation of Bordeaux, he, himself, Louis XVI.
 “ after hearing the case, proposed, with his own voice, in council,
 “ to return the land, which was accordingly done. *Mirabeau*,
 “ the inveterate enemy of the Parliaments, owned, that
 “ their Justice was without stain or suspicion, and that before
 “ their power the ancient aristocracy itself trembled.”

establishment

establishment of those abuses and corruptions which time had engendered, and which the benevolent efforts of the sixteenth Louis were directed to remove. These would necessarily be destroyed by constitutional means; and their renewal would effectually be prevented by the decided influence which, from past events, public opinion must acquire over the councils of the monarch, and over every order of the state.

Whatever may be the issue of the contest, it is our duty to court that success which the justice of our cause deserves, by exertions of vigour proportioned to the exigency of the case: and, notwithstanding the perverse representations and gloomy predictions of opposition, the relative situation of the two countries affords the most rational grounds for expecting an *honourable* termination of the war.

If, as your Lordship asserts, an *annual* deficit in the revenue of *three millions sterling* could effect the destruction of a fabric which had withstood the shocks of fourteen centuries,—with what propriety can you refuse your belief to the approaching ruin of an infant state, which has experienced a *monthly* deficit of more than *eighteen millions sterling**; and the support of whose army and navy was represented,

* The expenditure of France, during the last month, exceeded the revenue, by no less a sum than 443,164,994 livres, or 18,465,208 pounds sterling; which would make an annual *excess* of expenditure, of TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY ONE MILLIONS, FIVE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY TWO THOUSAND, FOUR HUNDRED AND NINETY SIX POUNDS STERLING!—Admitting this to constitute their whole annual expence, it amounts to a sum nearly equal to the whole national debt of England, previous to the war. The extraordinary deficiency of the last month is by no means unprecedented in the annals of the revolutionary finances.—That of April, 1793, was 460,000,000 of livres; and the deficiency in the two months of August and September, in the same year, amounted together to 800,000,000.

by

by its rulers themselves, in the month of September last, as *costing more than the maintenance of six millions of men*, dispersed over the various districts of the republic*. Is it credible, that a people labouring under such burdens, and under such distress, as no other people in the universe have ever experienced, should bear with patience the iron yoke of oppression, without harbouring a wish to recover that happiness and prosperity of which the revolutionary empirics have deprived them? The fact is, even according to the accounts of the Convention, that numerous insurrections exist in various departments, and I have particular reasons for believing that a general discontent prevails, especially among the inhabitants of the maritime provinces, who are ready to employ against the Convention, any arms with which we may be disposed to supply them. The *Cbouans*, whose gallant chief is now in this country, firm in their principles, and formidable in their numbers, are resolutely bent on the restoration of royalty: they occupy a tract of country, admirably situated both for defensive and offensive operations; and there can be no doubt but that our ministers will afford them that effectual assistance, which will enable them to improve the advantages they derive from their numbers and situation; and which will certainly tend, more than any thing else, to accelerate the conclusion of an honourable peace. Though the republican party have exulted in the *apparent* secession of La Charette and his friends, from the cause of royalty, I incline to think, that a very short time will suffice to convince

* See Lindet's report, from the united committees of public welfare, general safety, and legislation, on the state of France; made to the National Convention, on the 20th of September, 1794.

them,

them, that this affords them no just cause for exultation. The transactions, which have recently taken place between La Charette and the commissioners from the Convention, are, at present, involved in mystery; but the known principles of that brave chief, and the disposition of his gallant followers, afford the best grounds for believing that, when the hour of explanation shall arrive, their conduct will be found to have been more favourable than hostile to the cause they are supposed to have abandoned*.

* A most worthy and respectable member of the House of Commons having, as I understand, in consequence of the supposed surrender of La Charette, declared his intention of making some motion, having for its object the proposal of an accommodation with the French; I sincerely hope, before he proceeds to *act* upon an opinion which appears to me to be hastily adopted, that he will direct his enquiries, in a particular manner, to the objects I have here stated.—I trust, also, that even should his opinion, contrary to my expectation and belief, prove to be well founded, the proofs I have exhibited of the determination of the Convention to make no peace with England, until our government and constitution shall be annihilated, will have their due weight.

As an additional proof, of still more recent date, I beg leave to call his attention to the following extract of a letter from Plutet, one of the Commissioners of the National Convention, sent by that assembly to inspect the ports of Rochelle, Rochefort, and Bayonne.

“The greatest activity reigns in every part, and the very name of the English excites sentiments of hatred and revenge against that nation, to such a pitch, that every one is eager to concur in the means of *destroying a government which is founded on injustice, disloyalty, and a contempt of all social principles.*”

This letter was loudly applauded by the Convention, in the sitting of the 17th of February, 1795; which circumstance clearly demonstrates, that the present rulers of France are actuated by the same views as were entertained by their predecessors, and, indeed, by every party in France, since the deposition of the King.—*Delenda est Carthago*, as applied to England, is their favourite maxim; and I confess I see no prospect of averting the impending danger by negotiation, or, indeed, by any other means, than the adoption of a similar maxim—*Delenda est Respublica Gallica.*

From

From these circumstances I maintain, that the situation of our enemy is such as to afford us the most rational hopes of final success:—nor are these hopes, in the smallest degree, checked by the contemplation of our domestic arrangements.—Every superior department of the state is filled by men of undoubted talents, and unimpeached integrity; men who enjoy, because they *deserve*, the confidence of the nation. But, as extraordinary efforts can alone secure the accomplishment of that glorious object for which we are contending; let it never be forgotten that *unity of sentiment* is, in such a case, a necessary auxiliary to *vigour of exertion*.

London, April 27, 1795.



F I N I S.

TO

JOHN GIFFORD, Esq.

SIR,

PERHAPS I have as much reason to be ashamed of my excuse as of my fault. It was not until this day I read through your book, or I ought to have sooner acknowledged the great favour you have done me, in thinking me worthy of so valuable a communication. I think it is clearly the best production which has appeared in this controversy—great and exact knowledge of the subject; wise and enlarged principles of policy;---a virtuous and manly indignation against the criminals of France and their abettors in England; a generous sympathy with our sufferers in the common cause;---an active, vigorous, clear, and rapid style; a close and just argumentation—these are things which no fair and discerning reader can deny to your excellent work. As to what you are so good as to say in favour of my poor SWINISH MULTITUDE (of which I wish I could with truth predicate that multitude) you had not the passage in your memory exactly. It is applied, in general, apparently; but, in reality, it is pointed to Mons. Bailly. It speaks of those literary men who had abandoned their patrons and protectors to court the multitude, to lead, and to participate in their trea-

U

sons.

sons. I predicted his fate but too truly, when I said that this pensioner of the unhappy Louis the XVIth (he had 6000l. English from him, a great thing in old France) would be trampled under the "*hoofs of a swinish multitude*." Miserable man! you know his end—as you know that his magistracy was the very first fruit of the rebellion. He "*threw his pearls before swine and they turned and rent him*." I never dreamt of our poor little English *piggen riggen*, who go about squeaking and grunting quite innocently—my thoughts were on the wild boar of the gallic forest. What ours may be, if they are let wild, and have their tusks grown, and are under the guidance of such an *Euphorbus* as LORD LAUDERDALE, I cannot answer for. I wish I had seen your pamphlet before I had finished what I have written on the regicide peace. However I may possibly, by altering some passages and omitting others, make room for my sentiments on the information you have afforded me,

I have the honour to be, with great respect and esteem, Sir,

Your most obedient

And humble Servant,

EDMUND BURKE.

Beaconsfield, March 7, 1799.

